

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY

OF THE

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Volume XII (1932)

INDEX

to the Monthly Summary of the League of Nations.

(Volume XII—1932)

Abbreviations.

Cttee.	=	Committee.
Comm.	=	Commission.
Conf.	=	Conference.
Conv.	=	Convention.
Govt.	=	Government.
I.L.O.	=	International Labour Office.
Org.	=	Organisation.
Perm.	=	Permanent.
Sec. Gen.	=	Secretary-General.

Administrative Tribunal of League
Members: list and reappointments . . . 78, 303
Work 33

Admission of States to League
See Iraq and Turkey

Agricultural Questions

Cereals in countries of Central and Eastern Europe: work of Stresa Conf. and European Union Comm., etc. . . 7, 274-6, 350
Committee, Agricultural
Agricultural experts
Adjournment of meeting . . . 7, 10
Members, list of . . . 68
Delegations of Economic Cttee. and Int. Institute of Agriculture: members . . . 68
Experts, agricultural, *see above under Cttee., Agricultural*
Institute, Int., at Rome: relations with League . . . 288
Mortgage Credit Co., Int. Agricultural Convention, question of ratifications . 3, 11
Members . . . 70
Preferential customs régime: extension to products other than cereals
Special Cttee. 9
Transport of agricultural produce . . . 196

Air Transport Co-operation
See under Civil aviation

Allocation of Expenses of League
Committee: list of members . . . 77
Iraq and Turkey: number of units assigned to . . . 302, 316 (*resol.*)
Work of 4th Cttee. of Assembly . . . 302

Anatolia, Coasts of
Delimitation of territorial waters between Island of Castellorizo and, *see* Territorial waters, etc.

Anglo-French Declaration concerning European Affairs in which other States are invited to participate
Statement by Sir John Simon . . . 235

Anglo-Persian Oil Company: Dispute between Governments of Persia and United Kingdom
Examination of question by Cl. . . 345, 362

Arbitral Tribunal, Hungary-Czechoslovak Mixed
Cases filed with Registry of Perm. Court 239, 307

Archaeology 156

Armaments, Reduction, Limitation or Prohibition

Aggression, reduction of means of . . . 209 (*resol.*), 212, 217

Air armaments

Air Comm. and Sub-Cttee.: constitution and work 38, 79, 110, 111, 120, 182, 186, 216

Aircraft carriers, *see that title below*

Bombing planes and bombardment from the air, prohibition of 183, 184, 185, 209, 210 (*resol.*), 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 223, 224, 246, 247, 273, 320, 323, 324

Civil aviation, internationalisation of, *see* Civil aviation

French plan 323

Military aviation, proposed abolition or restriction 37, 38, 110, 120, 147, 185, 186, 209 (*resol.*), 212, 219, 221, 320, 323, 324
Resolution of Conf., July 1932 . . . 209 (*text*), 212, 213

Aircraft carriers 37, 120, 146, 182, 183, 185, 368, 369

Chemical, bacteriological and incendiary warfare
Committee, Special: composition and work . . . 146, 147, 182, 321, 352
Prohibition and violation of provisions *re* 38, 120, 147, 182, 183, 185, 209, 210 (*resol.*), 212, 213, 222, 223, 224, 246, 247, 273, 320

Commission, Perm., *see below* Perm. Comm.

Criteria for limitation and reduction . . . 118, 119, 345 (*resol.*), 368

Disarmament Conference, *see that title*

Draft Convention . . . 36, 37, 38 (*draft resol.*), 110-11, 186, 351

Economic and financial crisis in relation to . . . 36, 37, 183

Effectives, *see below under* Land Armaments and Naval armaments

Equality of rights, principle of . . . 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 248, 273, 321, 323, 324, 346, 351 (*Agreement*)

Expenditure on national defence

Commission on National Defence Expenditure and Technical Cttee.
Constitution, programme, work 38, 79, 110, 111, 120-1, 147, 186, 214, 216, 217, 247, 273, 322, 352

Proposals and discussion 36, 111, 120-1, 122, 185, 186, 210, 222, 224

Five-Power Agreement, text and resol. of General Comm. 346, 351

French memorandum, *see also below* Security 320, 321, 322-3 (*summary*), 346, 350, 351

Armaments, Reduction, Limitation or Prohibition (*cont*)

- General and complete disarmament : Soviet proposal 38 (*text*), 185
- Hoover proposals 182, 183-4 (*text*), 184-5, 208, 210, 211, 216-24 (*passim*), 322, 323, 324
- Incendiary weapons, *see above* Chemical, etc.
- Interdependence of land, naval, and air armaments : reduction based on principle 209 (*resol.*), 212, 217
- Japanese proposals 350, 368-70 (*text*)
- Land armaments
- Artillery 37, 120, 146, 182, 183, 184, 185, 209 (*resol.*), 212, 215, 218, 219, 246, 247, 273, 320
 - Chemical warfare, *see above*
 - Effectives
 - Committee, Special : constitution, programme, work 146, 147, 186, 213, 273-4, 321, 351-2
 - Proposals, views and *resol.* of Conf. 110, 119, 147, 185, 186, 210 (*resol.*), 213, 223, 246, 247, 273-4, 322-3, 324 - Fortifications 182, 183
 - Land Comm. : constitution and work 38, 79, 110, 111, 120, 146, 182
 - Resolution of Conf., July 1932 209 (*text*), 212, 213
 - Tanks . . . 37, 146, 182, 183, 184, 185, 209 (*resol.*), 212, 215, 218, 219, 246, 247, 273, 320, 324

Moral disarmament, *see that title*

Naval armaments

- Aircraft carriers, *see that title above*
 - Capital ships 37, 111, 120, 146, 183, 184, 323, 324, 368, 369, 370
 - Coast fortifications 120, 183, 274
 - Cruisers and destroyers 183, 184, 185, 324, 368-70
 - Effectives 111, 274
 - French plan 323
 - Japanese proposals 368-70
 - Mines 120, 146
 - Naval Comm and Sub-Cttee . constitution and work 38, 79, 110-11, 120, 146, 182, 186, 216
 - Resolution of Conf., July 1932 210 (*text*), 214, 218
 - River war-craft 146
 - Submarines 37, 120, 146, 183, 184, 185, 324, 368, 369
 - Treaties of London and Washington 183, 184, 185, 210, 214, 220
- One-third reduction, *see above* Hoover proposals and *below* Quantitative disarmament
- Permanent Advisory Comm on military, naval and air questions
- List of members, etc. 59
- Permanent Disarmament Commission for supervision 209 (*resol.*), 212-13, 213, 223, 224, 246, 247, 273, 320, 324
- Petitions from various Orgs . examination 36-7
- Prohibition of certain arms, principle of *See also above-below the weapons concerned*
- Resolution of General Comm., etc. 37, 219, 345
- Qualitative disarmament 118, 119, 120, 146, 212, 218, 219, 221, 224, 323, 345-6, 368, 369
- Quantitative disarmament and reduction by one-third, *see also above* Hoover proposals 38, 119, 185, 215, 219, 220, 221, 223, 323, 368
- Reduction by stages or a single conv. 118-19, 345 (*resol.*)
- Resolution of Conference, July 23, 1932
- Commentary 211-15
 - Discussion, voting, adoption 215-16, 216-24
 - Preamble 208-9 (*text*), 211-12
 - Text 208-11
- Resolutions of General Comm. of Conf. 119, 345-6, 351

Armaments, Reduction, Limitation or Prohibition (*cont*)

- Security in relation to disarmament 210-11 (*resol.*), 214, 222, 223, 224, 273, 322
- Soviet proposals, *see above* General disarmament and Quantitative disarmament
- Supervision, *see above* Perm Disarmament Comm
- Truce, Armaments . extension 207, 211 (*resol.*), 215, 217, 218, 320, 325, 346
- United Kingdom, proposals (*see also above*)
- Equality of rights 38 (*text*), 320, 321, 323-4 (*summary*), 346, 350

Arms, Ammunition, etc., Private Manufacture and Publicity of

- Special Commission
- Composition, list of members 3, 60
- Work of Disarmament Conf and Cttee and Sub-Cttee appointed by 185, 210 (*resol.*), 213, 217, 222, 246, 247, 274, 320-1, 352

Arms, Ammunition, etc., Trade in

- Work of Disarmament Conf and Cttee. and Sub-Cttee appointed by 185, 210 (*resol.*), 213, 217, 246, 247, 274, 320-1

Arts and Letters

- Exhibition of modern art, 1937 130
- History of art, creation of int. centre for institutes on 156
- Intellectual Co-operation Cttee, work of . 255
- Monuments, *see that title*
- Permanent Committee
- Activities in relation to financial restrictions 254
 - Agenda 129, 156
 - Members, list 72
 - Work during 2nd Session 156
- Poetry, encouragement of 130, 156
- Popular Arts Exhibition : postponement till 1939 233
- Theatre, int., rôle of 156
- Works of art : training of restorers ; influence of maritime climatic conditions, transport by sea 353

Assembly of League

- Constitution 59
- Rules of Procedure
- Rules 4 and 17, amendment 279, 308 (*resol.*)
 - Rule 12, deletion 308 (*resol.*)
- 13th Session, *see also Monthly Summary*, Nos 8 and 9 and 10
- Bureau, constitution of 246
 - Committees
 - Agenda Cttee : composition 246
 - Committees 1-6, distribution of items among 245-6 - Delegations represented at 244
 - Opening speech by President-in-office of Council 244-5
 - President
 - Election 245
 - Speech at close of Session 272 - Resolutions (*text*) 308-18
- Special Session on Sino-Japanese dispute, *see under* Dispute, Sino-Japanese .

Assyrians

- Community in Iraq 256, 355-7, 357 (*resol.*)
- Refugees, *see* Refugees, Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, etc.

Audit of League Accounts

- Auditor and deputy auditor 77
- 13th Financial period : adoption 316 (*resol.*)

Austria, Financial Situation of

- Examination by Financial Cttee. and results 3, 11, 70, 111, 121, 124, 148-52 (*passim*), 182, 193, 195, 208, 227-9, 252, 286, 288, 347
- Loan, 1923
- Position, *see* Loans, League
 - Trustee and agent 69
- Representative of Financial Cttee. at Vienna 69

Avenol, Joseph	
Appointment by Council as Secretary-General of League	272, 303, 350, 363-4
Balance of Payments, 1930	237-8
Banking Laws, Publication of	
See Currency and banking laws, etc.	
Bibliography	
Int. translation bibliography, publication	156
of Volumes in the League	176-8, 304-5
Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, Conventions on	310 (resol.)
Bolivia, Dispute with Paraguay	
See Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay	
Briand, Aristide	
Absence from Council meeting owing to ill-health	3
Death and tributes to	79, 111-12, 249-50
Bribery and Unfair Commercial Practices	3, 9, 10
Broadcasting	121, 129, 156, 186, 208, 216, 231, 234, 255, 289, 311 (resol.), 348, 353
Budget Equilibrium	
Re-establishment by States and other public bodies	347
Budget of League	
Estimates, 1933, as approved by Assembly	301, 316 (resol.)
Buildings at Geneva	
Budget estimates, 1933	301
Building Committee: list of members	77
Construction and financial situation in regard to	32-3
Bulgaria	
Financial situation	
Examination by Financial Cttee. and measures proposed	11, 79, 111, 121, 125, 192, 193, 208, 229, 230, 252, 286-7, 288, 347
Loans, 1926 and 1928, and Trustee for	69-70, 154, 230, 288
National Bank: Adviser	70
League Commissioner: Honorary Commissioner and appointment of M. Jean Watteau	69, 230
Refugees	11, 69
Calendar, Gregorian, Reform of	196, 348
Calendars showing Meetings of League Organisations and Commissions	33, 55-6, 113, 140, 178, 201, 238, 267, 305, 336, 366
Capital, Movement of	226, 237, 326, 347
Castellorizo, Island of	
Delimitation of territorial waters between Island and coasts of Anatolia, see Territorial waters, etc.	
Casts	130, 353
Central and Eastern Europe, Conditions in	
Cereal question, see Agriculture, Cereals in countries of Central and Eastern Europe	
Monetary problems	
Committee of Experts to examine Appointment and list of members	276, 327-8
Work	327, 350
Draft Monetary Normalisation Fund: preparation	275, 276, 327, 350
Stresa Conf. and European Union Comm., work	249, 274-6, 285, 350
Children and Young People, Protection and Welfare of	
Adolescents, health of: Reporting Cttee.	66
Adoption and exploitation	139

Children and Young People, Protection and Welfare of (cont.)	
Advisory Commission	
Budgetary estimates, 1933	314 (resol.)
Constitution: Sub-Cttee. to study modifications, etc.	138
Members, etc.	75-6
Publicity	138-9, 313-14 (resols.)
Reorganisation	298
Work	135
Blind children	138, 297, 349
Child labour: report of liaison officer of Int. Labour Office	137
Child Welfare Committee	
Members and assessors, see above	
Advisory Comm.	
Minutes, publication	314 (resol.)
Publicity for work	138-9, 313-14 (resols.)
Work of 8th session	135, 171, 297
Cinematography in relation to	137-8
Delinquency and juvenile courts	138, 297, 349
Desertion of the family: future study of question	297
Economic depression, assistance for children affected by	297
Education and instruction in aims of the League, see those titles	
Enquiry re children in moral or social danger	138
Illegitimate children	138, 171, 297, 349
Infant welfare and child of pre-school age, see that title	
Juvenile courts, see above	
Liaison officers of Labour Office and Cinematograph Institute: reports	137-8
Maintenance orders abroad, recognition and maintenance	137, 171
Nurses and social welfare workers: future study of social rôle	137
School children, Sub-Comm. on protection	63
China	
Anti-epidemic campaign in flooded regions, see under Health, etc.	
Communications and public works in: assistance of Transit Org.	289, 348
Conditions in as related to Sino-Japanese dispute	10, 48-9, 331, 332, 339, 358, 370-1
Co-operation with intellectual co-operation orgs. in Europe	353
Dispute with Japan, see Dispute, Sino-Japanese	
Educational reform in, see under Education	
Jehol Province, incident in	237
Refugees in and question of transporting certain refugees to the Chaco	172, 300, 315 (resol.)
Tientsin, Japanese military operations in	332
Cinematograph, Questions concerning	
Archives, cinematographic	233
Catalogues, int., of films, preparation	233, 328
Child welfare and instruction of youth in League aims as related to	137-8, 233, 329
Circulation, int., of educational films	290, 312 (resol.), 328
Congress, int., on education by cinema	329
Customs duties, abolition in educational films	233
Folklore films	329
Historic films, preservation of	233
League work, promotion by cinema	230, 233, 289, 329
Moral disarmament in relation to	121, 186, 216
Scenario rights and "droit moral"	329
Work of Cttee. on Intellectual Co-operation	208, 255, 348
Workers' leisure, rôle of cinema in	329
Cinematographic Institute, Int. Educational	
Executive Cttee., Perm.: members and work	73, 130, 328
Governing Body: members and work	13, 73, 311 (resol.), 328-9
Liaison officers, reports	137-8
National Cttees., creation	233
Work	208, 233-4, 311 (resol.), 328-9

Civil Aviation

- Air transport co-operation 155, 289
- Enquiry *re* publication or exchange of information on 12, 348
- Internationalisation work of Disarmament Conf 38, 110, 111, 120, 155, 185, 186, 209 (*resol*), 212, 216, 219, 320, 323, 324
- Relations between Transit Org and Universal Postal Union 12, 196

Clan, M.

- Death of 266-7

Coal

- International situation and means of improving 3, 7-9, 9-10, 182, 191-2, 286, 347

Commercial Treaties

- containing Most-favoured-nation Clause 187-8, 189
- Recently concluded 190-1

Committees and Commissions of League

- Meetings, list of future 33, 55 6, 113, 140, 178, 201, 238, 267, 305, 336, 366
- Members, list of 59-77

Coordinated Economic Action

. 189

Contributions of States in Arrears302, 316-17 (*resol*)**Conventions and Agreements concluded under League Auspices**

- Ratification and signature
- 13th Chronological list of ratifications, etc 250
- Methods of securing ratification under Ass *resols*, 1930 2, 5

Cost of Living

- Adaptation to int world situation 347

Council of League

- Constitution and membership in 1931-32 59
- Election of non-perm Members by Assembly (Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Poland) 272, 279, 350
- Method of election and Special Cttee to study existing system
- Appointment and work 2, 4, 208, 225

Court of Int. Justice, Permanent

- Accession of U S A : ratifications of Protocol, September 14, 1929 307
- Budget, autonomy *re* and estimates, 1933 173-4, 174, 301
- Chamber for Summary Procedure, 1933: composition 367
- Deputy judges, list 78
- Expenditure, British memo *re* enquiry into, *see* Expenditure of League
- Judges, list, and salaries, etc 78, 173
- Jurisdiction publication of collection of texts governing 115-16
- Optional Clause. signatures, etc 34, 142, 307
- Protocol of Signature of Statute, 1920
- Ratification by Peru 142
- Questions in dispute referred to Court 34, 56-8, 114-16, 141-2, 179-80, 202 6, 239-41, 267-70, 306 7, 336 8, 367
- See also* Arbitral Tribunal, Hungaro-Czechoslovak Mixed
- Danzig, treatment etc
- Emigration, Greco-Bulgarian
- Free zones of Upper Savoy
- Greenland
- Lithuania and Poland, relations between
- Memel Conv, etc
- "Prince of Pless Administration."
- Territorial waters between Island of Castellorizo, etc.
- Women, employment during the night
- Registrar and Deputy Registrar 78
- Registry, staff questions and work of Cttee. of Thirteen 173, 174

Court of Int. Justice, Permanent (*cont*)

- Revision of Statute: Protocol, 1929
- Ratification and entry into force 279-80, 308 (*resol*), 347
- Withdrawal of Cuban reservation 116
- Sessions
- 23rd Session (November 5, 1931—February 4, 1932) 56
- 24th Session (February 1—March 8) 56, 79, 114
- 25th Session (April 18—August 11) 141, 267
- 26th Session (October 14) 306

Covenant of League

- Amendments with view to bringing into harmony with Paris Pact Cttee. of representatives of League Members 347
- Articles invoked by China *re* Sino Japanese dispute, *see under* Dispute, Sino-Japanese
- League rôle *re* disputes between States
- Members as established in, *see under* Disputes between League Members

Currency and Banking Laws. Question of Publication

. 11

Currency Questions*See under* Monetary problems**Customs Formalities Int. Convention, 1923**

- Accession of Iraq 16

Customs Nomenclature, Committee of Experts on

- Members, list 68
- Work 35, 39, 192, 328, 347

Customs Tariffs

- Increase 187, 189, 190, 285
- Questions *re* to be studied by Monetary Conf. 226, 326

Czechoslovakia

- Election as non-perm Member of Council 279

Danube, Jurisdiction of European Commission

. 195, 196

Danzig

- Customs questions and "direct action" 156-8, 330, 350, 357
- High Commissioner
- Appointment and extension of appointment of M Rosting as acting High Commissioner 291, 330
- Count Gravina and Council tribute to memory of 74, 266
- Loans Municipal loan, 1925; Free City Loan, 1927. trustee and agent 70
- Port
- Access to or anchorage in of Polish war vessels 2, 13-14, 350
- Use by Poland of Danzig port 13-14, 131, 156, 350
- Railway questions 156, 330, 350
- Treatment of Polish nationals examination of case by Perm Court 34, 35, 40, 56 8 (*opinion*)

Deafness, Study of

. 284

Disarmament Conference

- For questions dealt with by Conference see under* Armaments, etc
- Bureau: constitution, work 37, 182, 246 7, 273, 320 1
- Commissions
- Air Commission, *see under* Armaments, etc
- General Commission. constitution and work 37, 38, 79, 110, 111, 118, 118-19, 146, 182-6, 215-24, 345-6, 350-1
- Land Commission, *see under* Armaments, etc
- National Defence Expenditure, Commission, *see under* Armaments, etc, Expenditure
- Naval Commission, *see under* Armaments, etc.

Disarmament Conference (cont.)**Commissions (cont.)****Political Comm.**

- Constitution 38, 110, 111
 Sub-Cttee., *see* Armaments, Moral
 disarmament
 Work 79, 110

Committees

- on Chemical and bacteriological warfare, *see that title under* Armaments
 Credentials Cttee. 36
 on Effectives, *see* Armaments, Land armaments
 on Petitions 36
 on Procedure 36-7
 Delegations 35-6
 Discussion, general 37-8
 German Govt.'s decision to withdraw from Conf. and return 246, 247-9 (*letters*), 321, 346, 351
 1st Phase, results 207, 209 (*resol.*), 212-13
 2nd Phase, preparation 210 (*resol.*), 213-15, 221
 President: Opening speech and speech at end of general discussion 35, 36, 37-8
 Proposals and draft resolutions submitted by delegates, *see under* Armaments, etc.
 Resolution approved by, *see under* Armaments, etc.
 Review of work up to December 1932 345-6
 Vice-Presidents 37

Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay

- Incidents and procedure *re* settlement 259-64, 272, 295-6, 333-4, 344, 360-2
 Russian refugees from China, question of settlement in the Chaco as related to dispute 172

Dispute between Persia and United Kingdom

See Anglo-Persian Oil Co., etc.

Dispute, Sino-Japanese

- Aggravation of situation, parties required to avoid, July 1 237, 258, 259, 291
 Anti-Japanese propaganda and boycott of Japanese goods in China 22, 22-3, 43, 44, 89, 105, 106, 108, 109, 331, 339, 371
 Assembly, Special Session of
 Adjournment 107
 Committee of Nineteen appointed by, *see that title below*
 Date of meetings 80, 199, 235, 357
 Debates in 79, 80-109, 235-7, 357-60
 General Commission: constitution 80
 Opening speech of President and election of Bureau 80
 Reference to Special Session 44, 47, 50 (*Cl. resol.*), 330-1, 332-3
 Report, *see below under* Settlement
 Resolutions
 March 4, 11 82 (*text*), 83, 96, 105-6, 106-7, 107, 108, 117-18, 133, 236, 237
 April 30 133-4 (*text*)
 July 1 236, 294
 States represented 80
 Commission of Enquiry
 Movements and itinerary 21, 22, 23, 52, 109-10, 134, 163, 198, 235, 237
 Non-existence since termination of report avowed by Japanese delegate 332
 Prelim. report 134-5
 Report, final
 Delay in presentation and extension of time-limit 198-9, 208, 235-6, 258-9, 294
 Examination by Assembly and Council 330-2, 358-60
 Observations of Chinese Govt. on Japanese views (below) and on statements by Japanese representatives (summary) 320, 370-4
 Observations of Japanese Govt. (summary) 320, 339-41
 Publication 259, 272, 295, 344
 Committee of Twelve appointed by Council: appeal to Japanese Govt. and reply 44-7, 49, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 100, 106

Dispute, Sino-Japanese (cont.)**Committee of Nineteen**

- Constitution and composition 107 (*Ass. resol.*), 295, 313, 331
 Enlargement to include U.S.A. representative proposed 359
 Work 108-9, 117, 132-3, 198, 294, 360

Council

- Debates and action taken by 21-7, 35, 41-52, 258-9, 330-2

Resolutions

- September 30, October 10, 1931 21, 23, 26, 48, 98, 99, 106, 109, 134, 198, 199, 357
 February 19, 1932 50

- Covenant, invocation of Articles 10 and 15 and compatibility of action taken under Article 15 with that under Article 11 23-5, 26, 27, 41, 44, 46, 87, 89-90, 93, 96, 97
re Manchuria, *see that title*

- Policy of expansion in Japan, alleged 370-1, 374
 Protection of Japanese nationals and property and plea of self-defence 22, 26, 48, 85, 89, 93, 99, 109, 331, 341, 358, 372
 Resolutions of Assembly and Council, *see above under* Assembly and Council
 Review of progress, 1931-1932 344
 Self-defence, plea of, *see above* Protection, etc.

Settlement, negotiations *re*

- Appeal of Cttee. of Twelve and Japanese reply 44-7, 49, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 100, 106
 Debates in Assembly and Council, *see above* Assembly and Council
 Drafting Cttee. to study questions *re* 360
 Report to be prepared by Assembly, procedure *re* 344, 358
 U.S.A. and other Foreign Powers, intervention 25, 26, 42, 43, 51, 81, 82, 83, 86, 107-8, 356
 Shanghai, events in, *see* Shanghai, etc.
 Territorial designs of Japan, denial of 22, 24, 26, 48, 49, 94, 106
 Violation by Japan (alleged) of Covenant, Paris Pact and Nine-Power Treaty 357

Disputes between States Members of League

- League rôle in and situation as established by Covenant 82, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89-90, 91-3, 100-5
 Non-recognition of means of settlement secured by force 86, 87-8, 88, 102, 107-8, 237
 Principles for safeguarding rights of nations 84, 85, 87-8, 88, 99, 100, 106 (*resol.*), 107

Documentation, Organisation of 197-8, 255**Doumer, M. Paul**

- Death and tribute to 175-6

Drummond, Sir Eric

- Resignation and tributes to 33, 245, 364

Economic Agreements, International 9, 154, 347**Economic Committee**

- Members and corresponding members 66-7
 Work 3, 6-10, 187-92, 252

Economic Consultative Committee

- Composition and list of members 11, 67-8

Economic Disputes between States

- Procedure for friendly settlement 3, 9, 10, 252, 286, 310 (*resol.*), 347

Economic and Financial Depression, World

- Children suffering from, assistance for 297
 Disarmament problem in relation to 36, 37, 183
 Health in relation to 281-2, 348
 Work of
 Economic Cttee 6-10
 Financial Cttee. 121-2, 193-4
 Int. Labour Conf. (16th session) 154

Economic Organisation	
Economic Cttee., <i>see that title</i>	
Economic Consultative Cttee., <i>see that title</i>	
Publications	200
Work during year 1931-1932	347
Economic Rapprochements in Europe	7
Education	
Adult education	208, 231, 289
Broadcasting, <i>see that title</i>	
in China, reform and mission of Chinese educationists to Europe 129, 130, 208, 231-2, 234, 255, 289, 311 (<i>resol.</i>), 348	
Educational Information Centres 231, 254, 310 (<i>resol.</i>), 353	
Instruction of youth in aims of the League, <i>see that title</i>	
Interchanges and study tours for young people	130, 231
Moral disarmament as related to	121, 186, 216
Physical	64
Schools, <i>see that title</i>	
Work of Cttee. on Intellectual Co-operation	255
Electric Power	
Transmission in transit of	196
Emigration, Greco-Bulgarian	
Moloff-Caphandaris Agreement, 1927: request of Bulgarian Govt. <i>re</i> execution Examination by Perm. Court 2, 34, 58, 79, 114-15 (<i>opinion</i>), 168	
Termination of work of Mixed Commission	29-30
Emir Feisul	
Visit to League Secretariat	140
Estonia	
Financial situation and trustee for 1927 loan	70, 252
European Union, Commission of Enquiry for	
Chairman, election	250
Members, Govt. representatives, etc.	60-1
Work	249-50, 274-6, 308 (<i>resol.</i>)
Exchange, Foreign	
<i>See under</i> Monetary problems	
Exchange of Greco-Turkish Populations	
Commission	74
Expenditure of League, Enquiry into	
British proposal and results	172-5, 237
Ferrie, General, Death of	195
Financial Assistance of Certain Countries	
Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Rou- mania, <i>see those titles</i>	
of Central and Eastern Europe Cttee. of Experts to examine	276
Work of Stresa Conf. and European Union Comm.	249, 274-6, 285
Delegation of Financial Cttee. and Govt. experts: members and work	153-4, 195
General report of Financial Cttee. 111, 118, 121-4, 148-53	
London Four-Power Conference 118, 122, 123, 127	
Stresa Conference, <i>see that title</i>	
Survey of League work, 1931-1932	347
Financial Committee	
Composition and changes in 69, 176, 287, 303-4	
Delegation	153
43rd and 44th Sessions: work	3, 10-11
45th (Special) Session: work	111, 121-7, 148-53
46th Session: work	192-5, 229-30
47th Session: work	252, 286-7
Financial Organisation	
Financial Committee, <i>see that title</i>	
Work during year 1931-1932	347
Finnish Ships used during the War by United Kingdom	
Claim of Finnish Govt.	2, 27-9, 167-8, 345
Fiscal Committee	
Members: list and appointments	11, 70-1, 176
Foreigners, Assistance to Destitute	
Composition of Special Cttee. of experts	137, 171
Free Zones of Upper Savoy and Gex District	
Examination of question by Perm. Court 141, 179, 182, 202-4 (<i>opinion</i>)	
Gex District, Free Zones of	
<i>See</i> Free Zones, etc.	
Goethe	
Programme of "conversation" on and communications from members of Cttee. on arts and letters	129, 156, 234
Gold	
Gold Delegation	
Members, list	69
Report, final 11, 192, 193-5, 286, 310 (<i>resol.</i>)	
Purchasing power of	193-4
Standard: working and results of abandon- ment	189, 190, 193, 194, 285, 347
Goods	
Freedom in the exchange of	193, 347
Transport by rail: negotiability of trans- port documents	12, 195, 289, 348
Gravina, Count (High Commissioner in Danzig)	
Death and Council tribute to	74, 266
Greece, Financial Situation of	
Adviser to Bank of Greece	69
Examination by Financial Cttee. and results 11, 79, 111, 121, 125-7, 149-53 (<i>passim</i>), 192, 193, 252, 286, 287, 288, 347	
Loan service, position, <i>see</i> Loans, League, Position, etc.	
Greenland	
Eastern: legal status of certain parts Question examined by Perm. Court 115, 141, 179, 239, 307, 337-8, 367	
South-East: legal status of certain terri- tories in Study of question by Perm. Court 239-41, 269-70, 367	
Health, Epidemics and Prevention of Disease	
in Africa: Conference of Directors of Public Health Services on various African territories	284, 348
Biological Standardisation Comm., Perm., work	63, 285, 348
in China: anti-epidemic campaign in flooded regions 6, 283, 285, 309 (<i>resol.</i>), 348	
Committee, Perm.	
Members: list and appointments	6, 61
Vice-Chairman, death of	281
Work	6, 281
Deafness, study of	284
Diphtheria, immunisation against	285, 348
Economic crisis and public health	281-2, 348
Epidemiological Intelligence Service: Eastern Bureau	
Advisory Council: members and observers	66
Budget: Sub-Cttee. for study and report of	65
Work	285, 309 (<i>resol.</i>)
Health teaching, Cttee. on	65
Leprosy Comm. and work	63, 285, 348
Malaria Comm. members and work	61-2, 283
Medical education, Cttee. on	65
Nutrition, <i>see that title</i>	
Organisation, Health Composition of Committees, etc.	61-6
Co-operation with various countries, <i>see below</i> Reorganisation, etc.	
Work	285, 309 (<i>resol.</i>), 348
Plague	284
Preventive Medicine, Sub-Comm. on	63

Health, Epidemics and Prevention of Disease (cont.)

Public health and health insurance: Joint Comm. of experts and Sub-Comm. for education of health insured	62
Radium, price of, <i>see that title</i>	
Reorganisation of health services and co-operation with Health Org.	
Bolivia	285, 348
Chile	148, 284
China, <i>see above</i>	
Czechoslovakia	284-5
Greece,	285, 348
Siam	283
Rural hygiene, <i>see that title</i>	
School, int., of higher health studies, Sub-Comm. for	64
Sleeping-sickness: Comm. of experts for co-ordination of research	63
Smallpox	284
Tuberculosis	
Economic crisis as related to	281-2, 348
Reporting Cttee. on questions connected with anti-tuberculosis campaign and work	65, 281, 282-3
Sub-Commission on	63
Venereal diseases	
Committee of experts on syphilis, etc. Reporting Cttee. on questions relating to	64
Members	65, 251
Work	251, 284
Sub-Comm. on prevention of	62

Historical Monuments

See Monuments, etc.

Hops

Experts, consultation of: arrangements <i>re</i> and results	9, 35, 39, 182, 192, 286, 347
--	-------------------------------

Hungary, Financial Situation

Trustees and agent for 1924 Loan: representative of Financial Cttee. in Budapest	69
Work of Financial Cttee. and results	3, 10-11, 79, 111, 121, 124-5, 192-3, 208, 229, 252, 286, 287, 288, 347

Import and Export Restrictions

during Economic and financial crisis	187, 188, 189, 190, 285
--	-------------------------

Infant Welfare and Child of Pre-school Age

Pre-natal centres: future study of question	137
Reporting Cttee. and Sub-Comm. on protection	63, 66

Inland Navigation

Passport formalities for personnel	195
River law, agreements and navigation, questions <i>re</i>	195, 348

Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League

Cinematograph use for	230, 233, 289, 329
Resolution of Assembly, 13th Session	310-11
Sub-Committee of experts	
Activities in relation to financial restrictions	254
Members, list	72-3
Work	208, 230-1, 289, 348

Intellectual Circles, Co-operation in International Work

.	216, 233
-----------	----------

Intellectual Co-operation

Committee on Intellectual Co-operation	
Composition in relation to financial restrictions	12-13
Members, list, renewal and appointment of new members	12-13, 71, 255
Work during 14th Session	255, 310 (<i>resol.</i>)
Executive Committee	
Activities in relation to financial restrictions	254
Members, list	71-2
Sessions, number of	255
Work	129-30, 353

Intellectual Co-operation (cont.)

Financial restrictions, <i>see below</i> Organisation, Financial restrictions, etc.	
Institute, Int., Paris	
Activities in relation to financial restrictions	254, 311 (<i>resol.</i>)
Directors' Committee	72
Governing Body	72
Work	208, 234
National Cttees.	233, 311 (<i>resol.</i>), 353
Organisation	
Financial restrictions and adjustment of programme and work	12-13, 254-5
Programme of work	310 (<i>resol.</i>)
Work	208, 289, 310-11 (<i>resol.</i>)
Secretariat: activities in relation to financial restrictions	254

Intellectual Rights 129, 182, 197, 233, 255, 329, 353**International Relations, Scientific Study of**

Conference of Institutes	129, 182, 197, 289, 311 (<i>resol.</i>), 348
------------------------------------	--

Inukai, M. (Prime Minister of Japan)

Obituary notice	176
---------------------------	-----

Iraq

Accession to Int. Conv. on Customs Formalities, 1923	16
Admission to League	14, 41, 208, 234, 256, 272, 276-9, 291, 313 (<i>resol.</i>), 349-50
Assyrian community in: situation	256, 355-7, 357 (<i>resol.</i>)
Contribution to League (units)	302, 316 (<i>resol.</i>)
Frontier between Syria and, <i>see under</i> Mandates	
Termination of mandate, <i>see under</i> Mandates, Iraq	

Japan

Dispute with China, <i>see</i> Dispute, Sino-Japanese	
Emigration of nationals, difficulty of	48, 49

Juvenile Courts 138**Korea**

Position as compared with Manchuria	49
---	----

Labour

Children, admission to non-industrial forms of labour	137
Women, employment during the night: interpretation of Conv., 1919	
Question examined by Perm. Court	179, 206, 270, 306, 336-7

Labour Office, International

Autonomy in matters of policy and administration	173, 174
Death of M. Albert Thomas	146, 175-6
Director and Deputy Director, <i>see</i> Principal Officers	
Liaison officer, report.	137
Rationalisation, <i>see that title</i>	
Staff, <i>see</i> Officials of League Orgs.	

Labour Organisation, International

Budget estimates, 1933	301
Conference, Int. (16th Session), 1932: results	154
Expenditure: British memo. <i>re</i> enquiry into, <i>see</i> Expenditure of League	

Lausanne Conference 154, 208, 226, 227, 285, 221**League of Nations**

Admission of Iraq, <i>see under</i> Iraq	
Organisations and Commissions	
Calendars showing meetings, <i>see that title</i>	
Members, list of	59-78
Position and work as defined by Mr. de Valera at 13th Session of Assembly	244-5
Publications, <i>see</i> Publications of League	
Report on work since 12th Assembly session: allusion to	246

League of Nations (*cont.*)

- Rôle *re* disputes between League Members,
see under Disputes between States
Members of League
Volumes on, catalogued in library between
January and May 1932 173-5
Year 1931-1932, survey of 314-50

Liberia, Request for Assistance

- Committee of Council, work of 53-5
Kru Coast, Dr. Mackenzie's mission to
167, 182, 199, 296-7, 345
Plan of assistance in economic, financial
and health matters, and application
53-4, 164-7, 286, 297, 314-5
Slavery and forced labour in, abolition . 53, 55

Libraries

- Committee of library experts: work of
6th session 182, 197-8
League library
Volumes catalogued in 176-8, 304-5
Work of Library Planning Cttee. . 199-200
Popular libraries and workers' leisure
130, 197, 289, 348

Lithuania

- Request to League for assistance 206

Lithuania and Poland, Relations between

- Railway traffic, question of resumption on
Landwarów-Kaisiadorys line: advisory
opinion of Perm. Court 2, 29

Loans, League

- New loans required by certain countries,
see Financial assistance, etc., *and the*
countries concerned
Position *re* loans already contracted and
memorial from League Loans Cttee.
149, 151-4 *passim*, 229, 230,
286, 288 (*memorial*)
Trustees, etc. 69-70, 230

Manchuria, Sino-Japanese Dispute concerning

- Commission of Enquiry sent to, *see that*
title under Dispute, Sino-Japanese
History and status as viewed by Chinese
and Japanese Govts. 339-40, 371
Hostilities, incidents and general situation
in 22, 23, 26, 43, 44, 48, 87, 88, 98, 100, 134,
163, 236, 237, 331, 340, 341, 372, 374
"Manchukuo" and general question of
independence . 48, 134-5, 198, 199, 257-8,
294, 331, 340-1, 341, 344, 358, 359, 372-4, 374
Withdrawal of Japanese troops required
by China 357-8, 374

Mandated Territories and Questions affecting

- Annual reports of Mandatory Powers 14, 350, 355
Commission, Perm. Mandates
Members, list and I.L.O. representa-
tive 71
Sessions, question of reduction of
number 14, 291, 313 (*resol.*)
Work 14, 291, 312 (*resol.*), 329, 355
Economic equality and purchase of material
and supplies by administrations of
A and B territories 355
Frontier between Iraq and Syria
Commission of Enquiry
Constitution and death of Chairman
41, 112-13, 199
Work 182, 199, 291, 329, 350
Frontier line, acceptance by Council . 329
Frontier, Syrian Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan:
delimitation 2, 17-18
Iraq
Frontier, *see above* Frontier, etc.
Petitions from Assyrian community
256, 355-7, 357 (*resol.*)
Termination of mandate and con-
ditions governing 2, 14-16, 41, 146, 158-60,
256, 291, 313 (*resol.*), 349

Mandated Territories and Questions affecting (*cont.*)

- Mandatory Powers: list of representatives
attending 22nd Session of Comm. . . 355
Petitions, examination by P.M.C. and
Council 14, 355
Resolution of Assembly, 13th Session . . 312-13
Syrian frontiers, *see above*
Tanganyika, administrative union with
Kenya and Uganda proposed . . . 355

Maritime Navigation

- Barriers to and measures to remove . 195, 289
Buoyage and lighting of coasts 195
Collisions at sea, penal consequences of . 196
Passport formalities for seamen and officers
195, 348

Maritime Ports

- Sanitary reorganisation of Chinese ports,
Sub-Comm. for 64
Ship fumigation, Comm. on 64

Maternity

- Report of Child Welfare Cttee. *re* future
study 137
Reporting Cttee. and Sub-Comm. for pro-
tection 63, 66

Memel Convention, Alleged Infractions of

- Deposition of President and two members
of Memel Directorate: examination of
question by
Council 52-3, 314-5
Perm. Court
141-2, 179, 204-5, 239, 267-9, 344-5

Mexico

- Election as non-perm. Member of Council . 279

Migrants, Passport Formalities for

- 195

Minorities

- in Iraq, guarantees *re* 15, 16, 158, 159, 160, 349
See also Assyrians
Minorities Committees, questions *re* . 292, 319
in Poland, petitions
Application of agrarian reform
161-2, 292, 399, 353-4
Ukrainian minority 2, 18-19, 319
Procedure *re* petitions and work of League 291-2
in Roumania: petitions from descendants
of members of former Szekler (Hun-
garian) Frontier Guard Regiment
2, 21, 163, 257, 349
Statistics of petitions, publication . . . 349
in Upper Silesia: petitions
from M. Leon Plonka *re* personal situ-
ation 2, 20-1, 160-1
from Mme. Franziska Senkalla and
M. Johann Mokros *re* personal situ-
ation 160-1
from Polish Catholic School Asso-
ciation 293-4
from Prince of Pless, *see* "Prince of
Pless Administration"
Review of year 1931-1932 349
from Union of Poles in Germany 161, 292-3

Molloff-Caphandaris Agreement, 1927

- See under* Emigration, Greco-Bulgarian

Monetary and Economic Conference, World

- Convocation and resols. of Lausanne Conf.
and Council . 151, 209 (*resol.*), 226-7, 325
Organising Cttee., constitution and work
226, 227, 251, 252, 326
Preparatory Commission
Convocation, composition and arrange-
ments *re* meetings. . 226, 227, 251-2, 326
Work of 1st session 320, 325-6
Questions to be studied by 226, 285, 325, 326, 347
Resolution of Assembly, 13th Session . . 309-10

Monetary Problems

- in Countries of Central and Eastern Europe,
see Central and Eastern Europe
- Credit, restoration of: question to be
studied by Monetary Conf. 226, 285, 326, 347
- Currencies, restoration to be undertaken
by Monetary Conf. 226, 285, 325, 347
- Exchange, foreign: supervision, restriction
and influence on financial situation
3, 6-7, 9, 187, 188, 189, 190, 226, 285,
325, 326, 317
- Gold, *see that title*
- Resolution of Int. Labour Conf. (4th
Session) 154

Monuments, Artistic and Historical

- Protection and preservation
130, 233, 289, 311 (*resol.*), 348

Moral Disarmament

- Work of
Intellectual Co-operation Org.
129, 233, 255, 289, 311 (*resol.*)
- Sub-Committee of Political Comm. of
Disarmament Conf.
110, 121, 129, 186, 216, 233

Most-favoured-Nation Treatment

- Present economic situation in relation to
187-8, 189

Motor Car Industry, Enquiry concerning

- 9, 154, 182, 192, 286, 347

Moveable Feasts, Economic and Social Aspects of Fixing

- 12, 196

Museums

- Conference of experts to meet in October
1933, to study various questions . . . 353
- Museums office, Int.: Directors' Cttee.
Members, list 73
- Work 130, 156, 233, 353
- Outdoor art museums, study of 130
- Scientific museums: work of Cttee. for
Co-operation between 232-3

Musical Records

- 130, 156

National Technical Equipment

- See* Public works, etc.

Nationality of Women

- 280, 308-9 (*resol.*), 347-8

Nutrition

- Committee of experts on methods of study-
ing: members and work 251, 281
- Popular nutrition in Chile 148, 284

Officials of League Organisations

- Declaration of Loyalty by 317 (*resol.*)
- Pensions, *see that title*
- Principal Officers, *see that title*
- Salaries, number of posts, vacancies, etc.
173, 174, 175, 302, 303, 315-16 (*resol.*)
- Staff Regulations 33

Opium and other Dangerous Drugs

- Advisory Committee: 15th Session
 - Agenda 139-40
 - Assessors: renewal of appointments . 173
 - Chairman and Vice-Chairman:
appointment 139
 - Members and new members 75, 139, 140
 - Printing of minutes and annual number
of sessions 171
 - Work 146, 168-71, 348
- Annual reports of Govts.: examination by
Advisory Cttee. 168-9
- Anti-opium pills (heroin pills) 283, 284
- Conference on limitation and control of
poppy cultivation and harvesting of
coca-leaf 170-1
- Consumption of opiates 264, 283, 284

Opium and other Dangerous Drugs (cont.)

- Conventions, Int.
 - 1925 (2nd Opium Conf.): ratifications
and application of Article 10 . . . 168, 171
 - 1931, *see below* Manufacture, etc.
- Gift offered by Director of Anti-Opium
Information Bureau 265
- Illicit traffic
 - Control and situation in various
countries 169-70
 - Work of Perm. Central Board 264, 265
- Manufacture
 - Convention on limitation, etc., 1931
 - Entry into force, question of . . . 264
 - Ratifications 168, 348
 - Transmission to non-Member States
30
 - Gift offered to defray expenses of pre-
paring index to minutes of Con-
ference 265
 - Model Code to assist Govts. to apply
provisions of 1931 Conv. 169, 299, 335, 349
 - Supervisory Body, relations with
Central Board 264
 - World, of morphine, heroin and
cocaine 264
- Morphine content of opium, Comm. of
experts for standardising methods of
ascertaining
 - List 65
 - Work 230
- Opium Comm. of Health Org. and requests
addressed to Health Cttee. 63-4, 283-4
- Opium-smoking in the Far East
Bangkok Conference, results 30-1, 170
- Permanent Central Opium Board
 - Members, list and appointments 31, 75, 176
 - Work 31, 264-5, 298-9, 348
 - Statistics 264
- Paraguay, Dispute with Bolivia
See Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay
- Passport Formalities for Migrants, Officers
and Seamen 195
- Peace, Organisation of
 - Co-operation of Press and women, *see under*
Press and Women, Co-operation, etc.
- Penal and Penitentiary Questions
 - Meeting of representatives of int. orgs.
148, 298, 314 (*resol.*)
 - Sub-Commission (composition) 64
- Pensions for Staff of League Organisations
173, 174, 175, 301, 316 (*resol.*)
- Persia
 - Dispute with United Kingdom, *see* Anglo-
Persian Oil Co., etc.
- Pflug, M. (Member of Road Traffic Committee)
Obituary notice 195
- Physical Education
 - Group for experts for study of 64
- Poetry, Encouragement of 130, 156
- Poland
 - Minorities in, *see under* Minorities
 - Re-election as non-perm. Member of Council 279
 - Relations with Lithuania, *see* Lithuania
and Poland, etc.
- Political and Social Sciences
 - Proposal by Prof. Shotwell 353
- Press
 - Co-operation in organisation of peace
3, 249, 290, 312 (*resol.*), 346
 - Intellectual rôle of
121, 186, 289, 311 (*resol.*), 348, 353
- Prices, Fall in and Price Levels
7, 10, 121, 191, 194, 226, 285, 326, 365

"Prince of Pless Administration"

Application of German Govt. and study of
question by Perm. Court . . . 2, 20, 160, 179-80,
239, 306-7, 337, 367

Principal Officers of Secretariat and Int. Labour Office

Assembly arrangements *re* number, status,
term of office, nationality, etc. . . . 302-3, 317 (*resol.*), 350
Declaration of Loyalty 317 (*resol.*)
Private secretariats 318 (*resol.*)
Salaries, *entertainment allowances* and
General Entertainment Fund . . . 318 (*resols.*)

Private Law, Unification of

Int. Institute at Rome
Governing Body: members and work . . . 73-4, 130
Perm. Committee: members 74

Production

Adaptation of cost of production to world
situation 347
Producers' agreements: question to be
studied by Monetary Conf. . . . 226, 326
Resolution of Int. Labour Conf. (16th
session) 154
Study, int., of certain branches . . . 3, 9, 182, 191-2, 286, 347
See also Coal, Hops, Motor-car
industry, Timber

Prostitutes, Repatriation of 137

Protectionism. 189, 190

Public Works and National Technical Equip- ment

in China: assistance of Transit Org. . . 289, 310 (*resol.*)
Committee of Enquiry
Composition 253
Work . . . 128-9, 154-5, 252-4 289, 310 (*resol.*)
Resolutions of
Assembly 154
Int. Labour Conf. 310 (*resol.*)
Schemes from Govts. of Austria, Bulgaria,
Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Poland,
Yugoslavia 128-9, 155, 252-3, 348

Publications of League

Distribution in libraries 198
Economic and financial 200, 237, 365-6

Quota System 187, 188, 190, 285

Radium, Price of

Sub-Committee for study 65

Railways

Petitions from certain Railway Companies
Nagykukinda-Arad Local Railway
Co. 254
Zelkova-Wolfsberg and Unterdrau-
Co. 196, 254
Traffic id Poland, *see*
under Lithuania and Poland, etc.
Transport, int., of goods by rail . . 12, 195, 289, 348

Rationalisation and Reorganisation of Secre- tariat and Labour Office

Assembly, work during 13th Session . . 272, 302, 315-16 (*resol.*), 350
Committee of Thirteen, work of. . . . 173, 174

Refugees

Bulgarian, settlement of: League Com-
missioner and Trustee of 1926 Loan . . 11, 69
Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-
Chaldean and Turkish
in China
Destitute as result of floods 300, 315 (*resol.*)
of German origin: question of
settlement in the Chaco 172
Inter-Governmental Advisory Comm.:
members and advisers 76-7

Refugees (*cont.*)

Russian, Armenian, etc. (*cont.*)

Nansen Int. Refugee Office
Budget estimates, 1933 301
Report of Governing Body, exami-
nation 300, 315 (*resol.*), 349
Resolution of Assembly 300, 315 (*text*)

Relief Union, International

Entry into force of Convention, 1929 . . 301, 349
Perm. Committee for 76

Reorganisation of League Services

See Rationalisation, etc.

Reparations and Inter-Allied Debts

189, 193, 194, 235, 347

de Reynier, Colonel

Death and tributes to 79, 112-13

Road Traffic Questions 348

Roumania

Financial situation and request to League
for assistance 193, 252, 286, 287, 347

Rural Hygiene

Conference in the East proposed 285

Saar Basin Governing Commission

Chairman and members 14, 74, 256
Reports 40-1, 256, 350

Schools

Interchange of teaching staff, Sub-Cttee.
on: members 73
International school of higher health
studies, Sub-Comm. for 64
Protection of school children, Sub-Comm.
on 63
Revision of school text-books 40, 130, 208, 231, 289, 310 (*resol.*), 348

Scientific Questions

Museums, scientific: work of Cttee. for
Co-operation 232-3
Political and social sciences: proposal by
Prof. Shotwell 353
Relations between int. scientific orgs. and
Intellectual Co-operation Org. 232
Work of Cttee. on Intellectual Co-operation . 255

Secretariat of League

Budget estimates, 1933 301
Constitution 59
Expenditure, British memo. *re* enquiry
into, *see* Expenditure of League
Principal Officers, *see that title*
Rationalisation, *see that title*
Secretary-General, *see that title and also*
Principal Officers
Staff, *see* Officials of League Orgs.
Under-Secretaries-General, appointment . 364-5
See also Principal Officers
Visit of Emir Feisul, son of King of Hedjaz . 140

Secretary-General

Appointment of M. Joseph Avenol by
Council and approval of Assembly . . 272, 303, 363-4, 350
Declaration of loyalty to be made by all
Secretary-Generals 317 (*resol.*)
Resignation of Sir Eric Drummond and
tributes to 33, 245, 364

Serological and Biological Products

Perm. Comm. on standardisation of . . 63, 285, 348

Shaanghai and Vicinity, Events in

See also Dispute between China and Japan
Assembly, Special Session convened to
study, *see under* Dispute, Sino-
Japanese

Shanghai and Vicinity, Events in (cont.)

- Cessation of hostilities
 Armistice negotiations and Conf. for restoration of peace
 50, 51, 80, 81, 90, 93, 96, 102, 109
 Assembly, work of 80-105, 105-6, 106-7 (*resol.*),
 117, 133-4 (*resol.*)
 Committee of Nineteen, work of 108-9, 132-3
 Council, work of . . . 42, 43, 44, 47-52, 88, 98
 Definitive cessation and Agreement,
 May 5, 1932 . . . 108-9, 131-4, 146, 163,
 163-4 (*text of Agreement*), 198
 Commission, Shanghai: creation and work
 41-2, 42-3, 44, 45, 97
 Incidents and hostilities 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 42, 43,
 44, 50, 81, 100, 133, 198, 332, 344
 Neutral zone: proposed creation . . . 42, 44, 48, 49, 51
 Ultimatum of Japanese Govt. . . 47, 48, 49, 99

Slavery

- in Abyssinia, Africa, Arabia 265-6
 Advisory Committee of experts: constitution approved by Assembly
 266, 272, 299-300, 314-15 (*resol.*), 349
 Committee of Experts
 Expenditure, contribution to 172
 Members 31, 76
 Work 171-2, 265-6, 299, 314 (*resol.*)
 Laws, regulations and information to be forwarded under Article 7 of Convention, 1925. 171
 in Liberia 53, 55
 Permanent Commission: proposal to appoint 266
 Special Bureau: proposal to create 266

Sokai, François

- Death and tributes to 80, 113

Statistical Experts, Committee of 70**Straits Commission**

- Report on work during 1931 135

Stresa Conference, September 1932

- States represented at 274
 Work 249, 274-6, 285, 327, 350

Students, Int. Meeting of 329**Supervisory Commission**

- Composition and changes in 32, 77, 140, 303, 316 (*resol.*)
 Work 32, 140, 237, 316 (*resol.*)

Suvich, M.

- Resignation from various League Cttees., etc. 303-4

Territorial Integrity and Political Independence

- of League Members 83, 84, 85, 86, 90, 91-2, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 106 (*resol.*)

Territorial Waters between Island of Castellorizo and Coasts of Anatolia, Delimitation

- Study of question by Perm. Court and prelim. procedure 115, 205

Theatre, International Rôle of 156**Thomas, Albert (Director of I.L.O.)**

- Death and tributes to 146, 175-6

Timber Industry, Situation

- 9, 127-8, 182, 192, 200, 286, 347

Tobacco Problem

- in three Eastern European States . 275, 276, 286

Trade

- Balance of payments, 1930, in relation to 237-8
 Removal of barriers to int. trade: question to be studied by Monetary Conf.
 121, 226, 285, 325, 326, 347
 Reports of Economic Cttee. on position of int. trade . . . 6-9, 182, 187-91, 252, 285
 Resolution of Int. Labour Conf. (16th Session) 154
 "Review of World Trade, 1931 and 1932" (first half). 365-6

Traffic in Women and Children

- Age-limit, abolition of . . . 136, 200, 313 (*resol.*)
 Annual reports from Govts.: examination 136
 Central authorities 137, 201
 Committee, Traffic in Women and Children
 Assessors, list 75
 Meetings 135
 Members, *see* Children and young people, etc., Advisory Comm., etc.
 Publication of minutes 314 (*resol.*)
 Publicity of work 138-9, 313 (*resol.*)
 Work during 11th Session 135-7, 171
 Conventions, Int., 1904, 1910, 1921
 Amendments to 1910 and 1921 Convs.
 136, 313 (*resol.*)
 Ratifications, etc. 135-6, 171, 298
 Documents published *re* 200-1
 in the East: Comm. of Enquiry
 Composition 363
 Work 139, 298, 349, 363
 Enquiries in Europe, America, and Northern Africa 297-8
 Licensed houses, abolition 298, 349
 Organisations, private: co-operation and examination of reports
 136, 298, 313, 314 (*resols.*)
 Prostitutes, repatriation 137
 Questionnaire to Govts. 171
 Souteneurs, repression of activities
 136-7, 313 (*resol.*)
 Women police 137

Transit and Communications

- Advisory and Technical Cttee.
 Chairman and Vice-Chairman, election 195
 Composition 71, 197
 Work 182, 195
 Conference, Fourth General (October 1931): work 11-12, 195-6, 310 (*resol.*)
 Death of M. Romein, Assistant Sec. Gen. of Transit Org. 195
 Organisation, work of . . . 289, 310 (*resol.*), 348
 Routes, transit: measures to be taken in cases of serious interruption . 196, 289, 348

Transport

- of Agricultural produce 196
 Air transport co-operation 155, 289
 by Rail, *see under* Goods
 Unification of transport statistics . 196, 289, 348

Treaties

- Application and respect by States
 93-4, 94, 99, 100, 106, 359
 Conventions, etc., concluded under League auspices, *see that title*
 Registered with Secretariat 5, 121, 142-4, 186-7, 206, 250, 280-1, 307, 325, 352

Tuberculosis

- See under* Health, etc.

Turkey

- Admission to League 207, 224-5, 344
 Contribution to League (units) . 302, 316 (*resol.*)

Under-Secretaries-General of League

- Appointment of M. Pilotti and Dr. Trendelenburg 364-5

Unemployment	154, 187, 191, 281, 282, 285	War, General Convention to Improve Means of Preventing	
Unfair Commercial Practices		Commissions of Investigation : draft regu- lations under Article 4	60, 146, 147, 346
<i>See</i> Bribery and unfair commercial practices		Sino-Japanese dispute as related to.	86
United Kingdom		Wireless Station, League	196, 200
Dispute with Persia, <i>see</i> Anglo-Persian Oil Co., etc.		Women	
Universal Postal Union		Co-operation in organisation of peace	
Relations between Transit Org. and	12	4, 290, 312 (<i>resol.</i>), 346	
Upper Savoy, Free Zones of		Employment during the night: interpre- tation of Conv., 1919	
<i>See</i> Free zones, etc.		Question examined by Perm. Court	
Upper Silesia		179, 206, 270, 306, 336-7	
Arbitral Tribunal, President of	74	Nationality, <i>see</i> Nationality of women	
Minorities in, <i>see under</i> Minorities		Traffic in, <i>see</i> Traffic in women and children	
Mixed Comm., President of	74	Women police	137
Veneral Diseases		Workers' Leisure	
<i>See under</i> Health, etc.		Cinema, rôle in	329
Veterinary Conventions, Draft	286, 310 (<i>resol.</i>), 347	Popular libraries, utilisation during	
		130, 197, 289, 348	

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. I.

JANUARY, 1932

Sixty-Sixth Session
of the Council

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
391, WELLINGTON STREET
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. I.

JANUARY, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, January, 1932</i>	2	(c) Relations between the Transit Organisation and the Universal Postal Union	12
II. <i>Organisation of Peace and Reduction of Armaments :</i>		V. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>	
1. Supervision of Private Manufacture and Publicity of Manufacture of War Material	3	1. Adjustment of the Work of the Organisation and Composition of the Committee.	12
2. Co-operation of the Press in the Organisation of Peace	3	2. International Educational Cinematographic Institute	13
3. Collaboration of Women in the Organisation of Peace	4	VI. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>	
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		1. Danzig	13
1. Elections to the Council	4	2. The Saar: Appointment of the Chairman and Members of the Governing Commission	14
2. Harmonisation of the Covenant and the Paris Pact	4	3. Mandates :	
3. International Engagements :		(a) Work of the Commission	14
(a) Ratification of League Conventions	5	(b) Termination of the Mandate in Iraq	14
(b) Registration of Treaties.	5	(c) The Syrian, Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan Frontier	17
IV. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		VII. <i>Protection of Minorities :</i>	
1. The Health Organisation : Work of the Health Committee	6	1. The Ukrainian Minority in Poland	18
2. The Economic and Financial Organisation :		2. Minorities in Upper Silesia :	
(a) Work of the Economic Committee	6	(a) Petition from the Prince of Pless	20
(b) Work of the Financial Committee	10	(b) Petitions from M. Leon Plonka, of Baumgarten, and the " Caritasverband," of Breslau	20
(c) Agricultural Credit	11	3. Protection of Minorities in Roumania	21
(d) Composition of the Economic Consultative Committee	11	VIII. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
(e) Appointments to the Fiscal Committee	11	i. Appeal of the Chinese Government	21
3. Communications and Transit :			
(a) Fourth General Transit Conference	11		
(b) Information concerning Civil Aviation	12		

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

	PAGE		PAGE
2. Claim of the Finnish Government against the British Government with regard to Finnish Vessels used during the War by the British Government	27	X. <i>Other Questions :</i>	
3. Lithuania and Poland	29	1. Meeting of the Supervisory Commission	32
4. Greco-Bulgarian Inter-Migration	29	2. The League Buildings	32
IX. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions :</i>		3. Session of the League Administrative Tribunal	33
1. Traffic in Opium :		4. Question of the Resignation of Sir Eric Drummond	33
(a) Limitation of Drug Manufacture	30	XI. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	33
(b) Opium Smoking in the Far East	30		
(c) Meeting of the Permanent Central Opium Board	31	<i>The Permanent Court of International Justice.</i>	
2. Slavery	31	1. Treatment of Polish Nationals, etc., at Danzig	34
		2. The Caphandaris-Moloff Agreement of December 9th, 1927	34
		3. Optional Clause	34

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH,

January, 1932.

The sixty-sixth session of the Council was the principal meeting in January. Other meetings were those of the Economic and Financial Committees, the Gold Delegation, the Committee of Coal Experts, the Permanent Central Opium Board, and the Supervisory Commission.

The sixty-sixth session of the Council opened on January 25th at Geneva, and was still in session at the end of the month. Its agenda included between thirty and forty questions dealing with all branches of the League's activity, the most important being that of the appeal of the Chinese Government under Article 11 of the Covenant.

In the legal and constitutional field the Council constituted a Committee to study the present system of Council elections, made arrangements with regard to the date of convocation of a Committee on the harmonisation of the Covenant and the Paris Pact, and considered the position as regards the ratification of League Conventions.

Important decisions were taken in connection with certain Mandates. The Council approved the opinion of the Permanent Mandates Commission with regard to the termination of the Mandate in Iraq, and set up a Committee to draft the declarations which Iraq would be required to make before the Council. It also approved an agreement between the British

and French Governments concerning the Syrian, Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan frontier.

The minority questions before the Council concerned petitions from the Ukrainian minority in Poland, the German minority in Upper Silesia, and the descendants of the former Szekler Frontier Guard Regiment, in Roumania.

As regards Danzig, the Council noted the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice concerning access to the port of Danzig and the anchorage of Polish war vessels, and referred a question concerning the use of the port to the Special Committee which had already made a study of certain matters in connection with Danzig.

In addition to the Chinese appeal under Article 11, the political questions before the Council included the claim of the Finnish Government against the British Government regarding Finnish vessels used by the latter during the war, the Liberian Government's request for assistance, Lithuania's application concerning traffic on the Landwarów-Kaisiadorys railway line, and the termination of the work of the Greco-Bulgarian Inter-Migration Commission.

The Council also reviewed the work of the Economic and Financial Committees, the Health Committee, the Fourth General Transit Conference, and the International Educational Cinematographic Institute.

The presidency of the sixty-sixth session of the Council fell to France. As the French Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs was detained in Paris by public affairs, and as M. Briand was prevented for reasons of health from attending the session, M. Paul-Boncour took the Chair.

The British representative, Lord Cecil, expressed his profound regret at M. Briand's absence, and his good wishes for his prompt recovery. This motion having been unanimously and spontaneously supported by the other Members of the Council, the President sent a telegram conveying this tribute to the French Government and the Permanent French Delegate.

M. Briand replied by the following telegram :

" I thank you very heartily for your telegram. Please convey my gratitude to all our colleagues on the Council and tell them how touched I am by their good wishes and by the friendly sentiments they have expressed. With compliments and best wishes—Aristide Briand."

* * *

The thirty-seventh session of the Economic

Committee was held from January 14th to 19th. The principal feature of this session was an exchange of views regarding the influence of the financial situation on the régime of international exchanges. The Committee also considered the question of economic *rapprochements* in Europe, the international situation in certain branches of production (in which connection it reviewed the work of the coal experts), agriculture, bribery and unfair commercial practices, and procedure for the friendly settlement of economic disputes between States. It held a joint meeting with the Financial Committee to consider certain questions touching the activity of both Committees.

The forty-fourth session of the Financial Committee opened a few days before the Council meeting. The Committee considered the first quarterly reports of its Vienna and Buda-Pest representatives on the financial position of Austria and Hungary, the ratification of the Convention creating the International Educational Mortgage Credit Company, etc.

The Permanent Central Opium Board sat from January 18th to 23rd.

II.—ORGANISATION OF PEACE AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

I. SUPERVISION OF PRIVATE MANUFACTURE AND PUBLICITY OF MANUFACTURE OF WAR MATERIAL.*

Persia and Venezuela, whose mandate as Members of the Council expired last Assembly, were invited to continue to sit on the Special Commission entrusted with the preparation of a draft Convention for the Supervision of the Private Manufacture and Publicity of Manufacture of Arms.

States which are no longer Members of the Council cease automatically to be members of the Special Commission.

2. CO-OPERATION OF THE PRESS IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.*

The study of the problem of the spread of false information which may threaten to disturb peace or the good understanding between nations was considered by the Council in virtue of a resolution of the Twelfth Assembly.†

A Conference of Directors of Official Press Bureaux which the Danish Government had announced its intention of summoning met in Copenhagen from January 11th to 14th. At the Council meeting, the rapporteur, M. de

Zulueta (Spain) analysed the results of this Conference, drawing the Council's attention to the three points on which resolutions had been voted: the question of inaccurate information; the action already taken or to be taken as a result of the Conference of Press Experts of 1927, and the possibility of co-operation between official press bureaux.

The rapporteur expressed the view that the results proved how happily the Danish Government was inspired when it summoned the Conference. From the outset the very composition of the Conference made it clear that the freedom of the press was to be scrupulously respected, an attitude which the rapporteur regarded as essential, and which the Council had always been most careful to observe whenever dealing with questions relating to the press.

The rapporteur concluded that it remained for the Council to await the results of the Secretary-General's inquiry among Press Associations which would complete the material necessary for the report on the question of inaccurate information demanded by the Assembly.

The Council noted the success of the undertaking and tendered its thanks to the Danish Government.

* Rapporteur: the Spanish representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 222.

3. COLLABORATION OF WOMEN IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.*

The question of the collaboration of women with the Disarmament Conference was considered by the Council on January 26th, on the basis of a memorandum by the Secretary-General, prepared on the instructions of the Twelfth Assembly, after consulting the women's organisations.

Replies have so far been received from nine associations.† The principal suggestions submitted may be summarised as follows :

- (1) that the Council should study the possibility of inviting representatives of women's organisations as experts or observers at meetings of the Conference both plenary and private ;
- (2) that the women's organisations should, during the Conference, be able to send to the President studies, memoranda, etc., relating to some particular aspect of the disarmament problem ;
- (3) that the women's organisations should be able to keep in touch with delegates so as to be in a position to inform their national organisations as to the views and

intentions of the delegations of their respective countries ;

- (4) that the President of the Conference should appoint a day to receive at a plenary meeting of the Conference women's deputations desiring to submit to the Conference texts or declarations in favour of disarmament signed by millions of men and women of all countries ;
- (5) that the documentary information placed by the Secretariat at the disposal of the press should also be communicated to these organisations, and that arrangements should be made for their accredited representatives to have access to meetings of the Conference.

Most of these suggestions the Council considered were questions that could best be settled by the Disarmament Conference, to which it requested the Secretary-General to communicate his memorandum. It thanked the women's organisations for their replies, and expressed its appreciation of the work they were doing in favour of peace and the hope that the Conference would be able to utilise their services.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

1. ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL.‡

A special committee to study the system of elections to the Council was constituted by the Council to include representatives of the following Members of the League: Argentine, Belgium, Great Britain, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

This measure was taken to conform with the resolution of the Twelfth Assembly§ which requested the Council to appoint a special

* Rapporteur: the Spanish representative.

† (a) The Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organisations (comprising fourteen large international organisations).

(b) The International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues (which includes sixty federated Leagues in different countries).

(c) The International Trade Union Committee of Women Workers (which represents more than two million women organised in the trade unions affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions).

(d) The Federation of German Women's Associations.

(e) The Federation of German University Women.

(f) The French Union for Women's Suffrage.

(g) The National Council of French Women.

(h) The Bureau of the Committee of the National Women's Suffrage Union.

(i) The National Council of Danish Women.

‡ Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

§ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 265.

committee to study the existing system of elections and to report to a future session of the Assembly on any reforms that might appear desirable. The Council authorised the Secretary-General to convene the committee for a date approved by the Acting President of the Council and the rapporteur.

2. HARMONISATION OF THE COVENANT AND THE PARIS PACT.||

At its session of 1931 the Assembly decided to create a committee consisting of representatives of all the Members of the League which, if this course were found desirable, might meet during the Disarmament Conference for the purpose of seeking unanimous agreement on the bases indicated in the report of the First Committee in regard to the amendment of the Covenant, in order to bring it into harmony with the Pact of Paris, and of drawing up a final text which might be voted by the Assembly at its session of 1932.¶

The Council considered the date for which this Committee should be convened. It was not found possible to foresee which stage of the

|| Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

¶ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 265.

work of the Disarmament Conference might furnish the best opportunity for the meeting of the Committee—should a meeting during the Disarmament Conference be found desirable—and the Council authorised the Secretary-General to convene it for such date as he might fix, in agreement with the President of the Conference, the Acting President of the Council, and the rapporteur.

In accordance with the Assembly resolution, the Secretary-General has already transmitted the text of the resolution and the report of the First Committee of the Assembly to the Members of the League, with a request for their views as to the lines on which they think agreement can be attained. The Secretary-General was authorised by the Council to circulate the replies to the Committee.

3. INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

(a) *Ratification of League Conventions.**

The Council had to consider what action should be taken on certain inquiries carried out by the Secretary-General in virtue of Assembly resolutions of 1930 regarding the ratification of League Conventions.†

The first resolution provided that the Secretary-General should annually request any State having signed such a Convention, but not having ratified it one year after the date on which it ceased to be open for signature, to inform him as to its intentions regarding ratification. The second provided that the Secretary-General should ask Members of the League which have neither signed nor acceded to such conventions in five years from the date on which they became open for signature to state their views regarding the conventions. A third resolution provided that the Council, after consulting any appropriate League organ or committee, should consider the expediency of summoning a second conference to consider whether the Convention shall be amended or other measures be taken with a view to facilitating its acceptance by a greater number of States.

The Council decided that the results of the inquiries undertaken under the first two resolutions should be brought to the knowledge of the various technical committees concerned, and that the information concerning the conventions and protocols relating to traffic in arms and the prohibition of the use of asphyxiating gases and of bacteriological methods of

warfare, should be at the disposal of the Disarmament Conference.

These organisations would then be able to propose any measure they considered appropriate to give effect to the Assembly resolutions.

In view of certain objections raised by the Chilean Government, the Council approved a statement of the rapporteur to the effect that there existed no intention of giving the Secretariat or any League organ powers of investigation and supervision; the aim was rather to obtain information for the purpose of rendering more effective the League's efforts to promote international co-operation and the development of international law through the conclusion of general international conventions.

(b) *Registration of Treaties.*

The international engagements registered with the Secretariat in January included the following treaties and agreements:

A Conciliation and Arbitration Treaty between France and Portugal (Paris, July 6th, 1928), presented by France;

An Agreement between France and Poland concerning the settlement of Poland's debt to France in connection with the unpaid balance of the occupation expenses of the Upper Silesian Plebiscite Zone (The Hague, January 20th, 1930), presented by Poland; a similar Agreement between Poland and Great Britain and Northern Ireland with regard to the occupation expenses of the Plebiscite Zone of Upper Silesia and Allenstein;

A Consular Convention between Poland and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (Belgrade, March 6th, 1927), presented by both parties; a Customs Agreement between the Argentine Republic and Finland (Buenos Aires, November 3rd, 1931), presented by Finland;

A provisional navigation Agreement between Finland and France (Helsinki, April 4th, 1931), presented by Finland; a Declaration by Estonia and Finland concerning the reciprocal recognition of tonnage certificates for Finnish and Estonian vessels (Helsinki, July 17th, 1931), presented by Finland;

An Exchange of Notes between Italy and the Netherlands embodying an Agreement concerning the reciprocal recognition of certificates of airworthiness for aircraft and of engine certificates (Rome, October 2nd and 3rd, 1931), presented by the Netherlands;

A Convention between Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden concerning the collection of maintenance allowances (Oslo, February 10th, 1931), registered at the request of Norway and Denmark; a Convention between the same parties concerning certain provisions of international private law with regard to marriage adoption and guardianship (Stockholm, February 6th, 1931), registered at the request of Denmark.

* Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 266.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

1. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

Work of the Health Committee.

The report of the Health Committee on its eighteenth session was approved by the Council on January 25th.

As regards the anti-epidemic campaign in the flooded regions of China, the rapporteur* referred to the generosity of the Danish, Netherlands, Polish and Spanish Governments, who had responded to the Assembly's appeal in October. Since then other Governments, as well as individuals, had given further evidence of their desire to extend assistance to the flood victims in China. Although the Spanish Government had already sent an expert in fumigation to China, its Health administration has offered to place a large quantity of anti-typhoid vaccine at the disposal of the Chinese sanitary authorities. Egypt has sent to China a complete mobile laboratory directed by an expert bacteriologist with two assistants, together with large quantities of small-pox and cholera vaccines. The French Government has directed the Governor-General of Indo-China to send to Shanghai anti-plague serum. The English Society of Friends has contributed the sum of £250.

Appointments.—The Council confirmed two appointments to the Health Committee: Dr. Lasnet, in charge of the health services of the French Colonies, to succeed the late Dr. Lucien Raynaud; and Professor E. Hüsamettin Bey, Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare at Ankara.

2. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) Work of the Economic Committee.

1. *Thirty-seventh Session.*—The Economic Committee held its thirty-seventh session at Geneva from January 14th to 19th, under the presidency of M. Schüller (Austria).

There were present: M. R. Schüller (Chairman) (Austrian); M. W. Stucki (Vice-Chairman) (Swiss), Sir Sydney Chapman (British), M. Curcin (replacing M. Todorovic (Yugoslav), M. A. Di Nola (Italian), M. F. Dolezal (Polish), M. P. Elbel (French), M. L. Gerard (replacing M. van Langenhove) (Belgian), M. N. Ito (Japanese), Mr. H. A. F. Lindsay (India), M. V. Lundvik (Netherlands), M. F. Peroutka (Czechoslovak), M. E. Trendelenburg (German) (replaced at the first meetings by M. Imhoff); and the

following corresponding members: M. Neculcea (Roumanian) and M. de Nickl (Hungarian).

The session was mainly devoted to consideration of the following questions:

(1) *Influence of the financial situation on the régime of international exchanges.*—The Economic Committee began by observing that the economic depression which had prevailed for the last three years had suddenly become more acute in July, 1931. International trade had had to cope with notorious difficulties. These, however, were relatively negligible compared with the countless barriers and obstacles which had suddenly arisen in multiple forms during the last few months, and which now weighed heavily on international trade. Restrictive measures in the most varied forms had been enacted by Governments. But the last period of intensive struggle and acute depression was clearly distinguishable from those which preceded it, being almost wholly dominated by the grave disorders which, since last July, had been a feature of the monetary and financial situation. Nearly all European countries have taken drastic measures to restrict their imports as far as possible and increase their exports. Since all countries are acting in the same way, the second of these measures is generally without effect. The first, on the contrary, proves only too successful, resulting in a wholesale falling off in commercial exchanges and hence a serious depression in economic life. Considering it from a general standpoint, the Committee was forced to the conclusion that the result of national measures to cope with the effect of the crisis was almost inevitably to prolong and seriously to aggravate it.

The restrictive measures recently applied by most countries are explained, even in the case of countries whose finances are soundest, by the anxiety to safeguard their production or correct their balance of payments. For this only two methods are available: action in the sphere of financial obligations towards foreign countries (debts), or measures designed to influence foreign trade (imports and exports).

All the measures taken by the different States in the matter of foreign exchange and the regulation of exchanges are directed in the last resort towards two main objectives: they are designed either to protect the national currency and the country's credit against any weakening which would mean a reduction of its gold and foreign currency stock or, on the other hand, to protect national production against the dumping of cheap goods.

* Rapporteur: the French representative.

The debtor countries, the first affected by the financial disorders, have been obliged to take measures to control foreign exchange, restrict their imports and increase their exports. In creditor countries exports have decreased, and there is a tendency for their imports to increase if, to cope with the situation, they do not take defensive measures. The result has been that credits and exports are alike in danger. The combined influence of these facts brings about a paradoxical situation, as a result of which the financial interests of the different countries are often utterly at variance with their economic interests.

The countries which are soundest financially and are in the position of creditors should, it would seem, be in favour of an increase in the exports of the debtor countries that the latter may become possessed of the means necessary for them to meet their obligations.

In its report, the Economic Committee arrives at the following conclusion: Economic relations between different countries are dominated by the problem of international debts of all kinds, the burden of which has been increased conversely to the fall in prices. Theoretically a country cannot pay its debts otherwise than by exporting gold or obtaining fresh credits or exporting goods. The first means is precluded by the smallness of the reserves held by most of the debtor countries. Complete loss of confidence is paralysing the international operation of credit, so that, until confidence is restored, export of goods is the only means whereby debtor countries can meet their engagements. These countries must therefore have a favourable trade balance, and the greater the volume of their debts, the greater that favourable balance must be. Such a position would not be incompatible with the interests of the creditors; on the contrary, it would give them a guarantee for the payment of the debts due to them. But, under the pressure of circumstances, the extra-European and European creditors are following the general tendency to set up even higher barriers to imports from abroad.

The Economic Committee fully realises that the creditor countries are also acting under the pressure of internal and external circumstances, the importance of which the individual Governments alone are capable of appreciating. But it cannot help realising at the same time that so long as the paralysis of international credit continues the extraordinary and exceptional conditions of the present time will place creditor countries in a dilemma: either they must lower barriers to imports from debtor countries or

they must expect to see the prospects of recovering their debts correspondingly reduced.

(2) *Economic rapprochements in Europe.*—The Economic Committee was requested by the Twelfth Assembly to study, on the basis of the preparatory work carried out by the Secretariat, and with due reference to the observations of Governments, the whole body of problems relating to economic *rapprochement* in Europe.

For this purpose the report of the Economic Sub-Committee was communicated to Governments with the request for their observations.

As several Governments have not yet forwarded their replies, the Economic Committee postponed till later its examination of the question, pending the arrival of other responses and further progress of the preparatory work carried out by the Secretariat.

(3) *Agriculture.*—The Economic Committee noted the resolutions adopted by the Conference held at Sofia from December 10th to 13th by representatives of Governments of Central and Eastern European agricultural countries.

The Economic Committee had consulted the agricultural experts with regard to the expediency of holding a further consultation on agricultural questions, approximately one year having elapsed since the second meeting of the Sub-Committee of Agricultural Experts. The majority of the experts were not in favour of a meeting in the near future, and the Committee decided to examine at a later session the expediency of summoning a meeting in the hope that circumstances would then be better adapted to such a step.

IV. *International situation in certain branches of production.*—*Coal.*—A consultation of coal experts was held at Geneva on January 11th. It bore upon the following points:

1. *International situation of coal production and trade.*

2. *International means of improving the situation.*

The consultation was attended by experts representing all factors of production (Government experts, experts with a knowledge of the interests of mine-owners and experts with a knowledge of workers' interests). The Italian expert was asked to represent the interests of consuming countries. The seven countries mentioned in Article 19 of the International Convention on Hours of Work in the Coal Mines were represented (Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Poland). A delegation of the Economic Committee also took part in the

work. The debate was directed by M. Schüller, Chairman of the Economic Committee.

In its report the Economic Committee briefly summarises the earlier stages of its coal inquiry,* and expresses the view that the improvement in the situation, very definite in 1929, had, unfortunately, not continued. The discrepancy between the production and the consumption of coal had increased; stocks were accumulating; chaotic price cutting had been accentuated by the recent monetary fluctuations and by the protectionist or restrictive measures taken by the various States. Unemployment was seriously affecting mining districts.

In these circumstances, the Economic Committee had considered that it should resume its inquiry.

After a thorough study of the situation, the experts meeting on January 11th formulated certain general recommendations. They unanimously proclaimed the necessity of an international agreement, which they considered as the only international means of improving the situation.

The Economic Committee embodied these recommendations in a report to the Council, which contains the following considerations:

1. All the experts of the producing countries present at the meeting, whether representing governments, employers or workers, were unanimous as to the advantages of an international agreement calculated to remedy as soon as possible the chaotic state of the distribution of coal. Everyone recognised it to be in the interests of all producers, whatever their country, to combine efforts for the purpose of regulating competition between them, and thus help to attenuate the effects of the crisis.

2. *National organisation*, they considered, was the preliminary necessary condition of international organisation. In this field a rapid organic development had taken place. The national measures, which were the pre-requisite condition of any international agreement, had been taken or proposed.

3. It was now easier than in 1929 to see the general lines on which agreement might be concluded for regulating the distribution of coal among the various markets.

(a) Government measures, which at present stood in the way of the free circulation of coal, did not seem to constitute an obstacle to the proposed agreement. An international understanding would find a corollary in an adjustment of protectionist or restrictive measures.

(b) A rational distribution of the tonnage

available, accepted by all parties on the international market, would enable each producing centre to adjust its output and to avoid the chaotic effects of present competition. Producers could direct their efforts towards the enlargements of their market.

(c) There seemed to be no doubt that, without an agreement, the coal industry would find it much more difficult to withstand the continuation of the crisis and to derive the full advantage it was entitled to look for from a return to normal economic life.

4. The representative of the consuming countries said that it would be desirable that the general lines of any agreement reached between producers should, beforehand, be communicated to the consuming countries in order that they might know whether the agreement might not have harmful consequences for them and tend to increase prices.

5. The Economic Committee considered the conclusions that might be drawn from the London Conference (September 13th and October 1st, 1931), at which mine-owners of the seven chief European-producing countries set forth the general lines of a plan of international organisation. The Committee hoped that the efforts to reach an agreement would be resumed at the earliest possible moment and actively pursued. It proposed that the Council should bring to the notice of Governments the international importance of this movement in the serious situation prevailing at present. The Committee emphasised the complex character of the negotiations which would be required if an international agreement on coal were to be reached, and recommended that the conduct of the negotiations and the conclusion of the agreements should remain in the hands of those who had to execute them and who must bear the direct responsibility, but it also recommended that Governments and the public should be aware of the general lines of what was proposed, so that they would be able to judge them from the point of view of all the factors concerned.

The Economic Committee proposed to follow attentively these efforts towards organisation. It expressed the view that the Committee of experts as at present constituted was both competent and adequate, and decided to summon it again when desirable.

In conclusion, the Economic Committee, in view of the fact that on the one hand the aggravation of the crisis, and on the other hand the progress effected in national organisation, showed that the realisation of the idea of an international coal agreement was both more

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 6, page 158.

urgent than ever and apparently within reach, considering the necessity for overcoming a crisis which affects one of the fundamental branches of production, and for doing so without thereby injuring the interests of consumers, whether countries or individuals :

1. " Proposes that the Council should communicate the present report to Governments, bringing to their notice the international importance of this movement in the serious situation which exists at present ;

2. " In accordance with the principle laid down by the World Economic Conference and confirmed by all subsequent studies of the Economic Organisation relating to the publicity given to important international agreements, the Economic Committee expresses its confidence that knowledge of the fundamental lines of the agreements which are already concluded, or which are to be concluded, will be available to all, so that the interests involved, and more particularly the consuming countries, may have all the information necessary to enable them to express an opinion on the effects of the said agreements."

Other products.—The Twelfth Assembly had provided for a study by the Secretariat and competent committees of a better organisation of certain branches of production and of trade connected therewith. The Economic Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare preliminary consultations of experts with special qualifications in the matter of motor vehicles, wood, and hops.

(5) *Special Committee for the study of the extension of preference to agricultural products other than cereals.*—The Economic Committee considered the conclusions of the special committee which met at Geneva on October 30th and 31st.* It decided to forward them to the Council without any special observations.

(6) *Procedure for the friendly settlement of economic disputes between States.*—The Economic Committee completed the studies with which it had been entrusted and decided to forward its conclusions to the Council, proposing the institution of an optional procedure of an elastic and rapid character to which Members of the League and non-Member States might have recourse at any time.†

(7) *Bribery and unfair commercial practices.*—The International Chamber of Commerce had drawn the Committee's attention to the advisability of endeavouring to eliminate from private commercial relations recourse to certain unfair practices, more particularly to various forms of bribery.‡ The Economic Committee framed certain conclusions and suggestions, which it

proposed that the Council should submit to the Members of the League.

The Economic and Financial Committees held a joint meeting to study the influence which financial and monetary disturbances exercise on international trade. The time at the disposal of the Committees being insufficient, they appointed a Mixed Committee to study the relations between present difficulties as regards international debts and credits and international exchanges and commercial policy, and to submit the concrete questions involved.

The Mixed Committee is composed of M. Stucki, M. Trendelenburg, M. Pospisil and M. de Chalendar.

* * *

II. *The Council Debate.*—The reports of the Economic Committee on its October and January sessions were considered by the Council on January 28th.§

The chapter of the report devoted to the influence of the present financial situation on the régime of international exchanges, engaged the special attention of the Council, which authorised the Secretary-General to bring it to the notice of Governments.

In his report the German representative observed that the close connection between these two spheres of economic life had perhaps never been so strikingly demonstrated as during the period of acute malaise which had begun last July, at the time of the first bank failures. " The present crisis had shown more clearly than ever before that no country, however powerful it might be economically, could avoid the undesirable repercussions upon its own economy which its own measures, leading to the adoption of similar measures elsewhere, inevitably produced. In spite of unceasing efforts to bolster up the contractual situation, it was becoming daily clearer that when the economic equilibrium is seriously disturbed, despite the very best intentions, the individual action of the various States, which is necessarily dominated by home considerations, is bound to impair still further the general situation."

Other parts of the report of the Economic Committee which were the object of special recommendations were those on the coal problem and on bribery and unfair commercial practices. As regards the first, the Council noted with satisfaction progress towards the national organisation of production and the possibility of the solution of the coal problem on an international basis in the near future. It requested the Secretary-General to

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, page 288.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 6, page 157.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, page 292.

§ Rapporteur : the German representative,

communicate the report to Governments, pointing out the importance of this tendency in the present situation.

As regards the report on bribery and unfair commercial practices, the Council recommended Governments and business and industrial circles to take all possible steps to put an end to this abuse. It invited the Secretary-General to transmit the report to the Governments of States Members.

In view of the proposal put forward in March, 1930, by the French delegation to the Conference for Concerted Economic Action, that a permanent organ for conciliation and arbitration should be set up for the settlement of all economic disputes between States, the Council decided to place at the disposal of States a body of experts to whom they might submit their economic disputes for settlement by arbitration or for friendly settlement by means either of an advisory opinion or of proposals for conciliation. In this connection it adopted rules of procedure appended to the report of the Economic Committee, invited that Committee to submit proposals for the nomination of the experts, and authorised the Secretary-General to take such steps as he might consider necessary under the rules of procedure.

The German representative drew attention to the fact that, from the German standpoint, the report was of very special importance. The Economic Committee had brought out with striking clearness the interdependence of international trade and international financial relations. To illustrate this the German representative thought he could not do better than quote the passage of the report of the Committee which stated that economic relations between different countries were dominated to an extent hitherto unknown by the problem of international debts, the burden of which had been increased conversely to the fall in prices. M. von Weizsäcker expressed the opinion that only when the conclusions of the Committee were generally accepted, when Governments decided to draw from them their logical conclusions, and when the absolute interdependence of the two factors, trade and finance, were recognised by all, would a way be found out of the present crisis. This conclusion had been confirmed by the Committee, which had stated that it was unable to formulate suggestions with regard to commercial policy so long as the necessary solution in the sphere of international settlement had not been found, and so long as the financial tension was not eased by the appropriate improvements and adjustments.

Lord Cecil considered the conclusions of the report as extremely important and deserving of careful consideration by all the Governments concerned. Special attention should be paid to the proposals concerning international discussion for the settlement of disputes.

The Chinese representative, M. Yen, drew attention to the importance of the Chinese market for world commodities, expressing the view that one way of restoring economic prosperity to Europe and America would be the promotion of trade with China. Unfortunately, as a result of recent events, China's trade was diminishing. The Chinese representative took the opportunity of calling the Council's attention to the inter-relationship between economic and commercial prosperity, and the settlement of the Sino-Japanese question.

The Italian representative attached great importance to the report, noting with satisfaction that it also drew attention to the apprehensions of the consuming countries. The latter, he said, feared that an international agreement between producing countries would eventually lead to an increase in prices. This would be prejudicial to consumers, and in the long run also to producers, since the former would employ other sources of energy, and this would lead to a further reduction of consumption.

The French representative expressed his regret that the Economic Committee had decided to adjourn a meeting of its agricultural experts. He hoped that this adjournment would be only temporary. He believed that the League had performed a very important action when it had marked the position of agriculture in the preoccupations of the world economic system, for there was no doubt that more than one important aspect of the present crisis must be considered in relation to agriculture.

(b) *Work of the Financial Committee.**

The reports of the Financial Committee on its forty-third and forty-fourth sessions were dealt with by the Council on January 29th.

The first of these two sessions, it will be remembered, took place in Budapest in October, and was devoted exclusively to the financial situation of Hungary. The results of this session were published in the *Monthly Summary* of October.†

The forty-fourth session took place in January, before the meeting of the Council, and in its report the Financial Committee

* Rapporteur: the Norwegian representative.

† See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XI., No. 10, page 293.

recapitulates the efforts made by the Hungarian Government to execute the plan of financial reform drawn up by the forty-third session. The Committee feels that considerable efforts have been made to deal with the situation, though more remains to be done if budget equilibrium is to be secured. While it is apparent that the condition of the public finances has improved since October, the foreign exchange situation has become more and more difficult, and on December 23rd a decree was enacted providing for the partial suspension of transfer on foreign obligations.

The Financial Committee again examined the situation in Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria, with the representatives of these three countries. It dealt at the same time with the question of the settlement of Bulgarian refugees, which did not call for any special action by the Council. The Financial Committee noted that all these countries had felt the strain imposed upon them by the intensification of the economic and financial crisis, but that in each case measures were being taken to improve public finance and to maintain currency. The rapporteur to the Council drew attention to the emphasis laid by the Financial Committee on the importance of Austria and Hungary establishing as soon as possible closer commercial relations with their neighbouring and other States.

As regards the financial position of Greece and Bulgaria, the Council authorised the Financial Committee to accept invitations from the Governments of these two countries to send members to the spot to make a study of the situation.

Another matter considered by the Committee and the Council was the question of the publication of currency and banking laws, for which the Rockefeller Foundation has contributed two hundred thousand Swiss francs. In view of the fact that vital clauses in the monetary legislation of the majority of countries have been provisionally suspended, it was suggested that this work should be held up for the time being. The Council approved this measure.

NOTE.—As a result of the change in the situation caused by the departure of many States from the gold standard, the report of the Gold Delegation will not be ready until the next Council meeting.

(c) *Agricultural Credit.*

The position as regards the ratification of the Convention creating the International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company was considered by the Council on January 29th.*

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 5, page 121.

Owing to the difficulties of the moment, the deposit of ratifications has not been effected so rapidly as might have been expected by the number of signatures to the Convention. Only three States, Greece, Latvia and Switzerland, have deposited their ratifications, but in a fairly large number of countries the Convention has now been laid before Parliament for approval, and ratification by those countries may be expected shortly.

In the circumstances the rapporteur, the Norwegian representative, proposed to the Council that it should leave it to its President, in agreement with the rapporteur on financial questions and the Chairman of the Financial Committee, to fix the date of the Conference, as provided under Article 15 of the Convention, should it be considered expedient to hold the Conference before the May session of the Council.

The Financial Committee having laid special stress on the great importance, under existing financial conditions, of the machinery of the Convention, which would afford investors most important guarantees, the Council drew the attention of the signatories to the importance of ratifying the Convention at the earliest possible date.

(d) *Composition of the Economic Consultative Committee.*†

The Council postponed to a later session the question of the revision of the composition of the Economic Consultative Committee.

It unanimously expressed its deep regret at the recent death of two members of the Committee: Dr. Shortt (Canadian) and M. Loucheur (French).

(e) *Appointments to the Fiscal Committee.*‡

The Council prolonged for one year the term of office of all the regular and corresponding members of the Fiscal Committee. It further appointed the following corresponding members:

Albania.—M. Rrok Gera, General Secretary of the Ministry of Finance.

Mexico.—M. Manuel Gomez Morin, Economist.

New Zealand.—Mr. Ernest John Robert Cumming, Commissioner of Taxes.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

(a) *Fourth General Transit Conference.*

On January 25th the Council expressed its satisfaction at the success of the Fourth General

† Rapporteur: the German representative.

‡ Rapporteur: the Norwegian representative.

Transit Conference,* and instructed the Secretary-General to convey its thanks to the members of the Transit Committee whose term of office has come to an end.

It decided to bring to the knowledge of the religious authorities concerned the Act regarding the economic and social aspects of fixing moveable feasts adopted by the Fourth General Transit Conference, and expressed the hope that they would consider in the most favourable spirit what action they might take in the matter.

The Council drew the attention of Governments to the importance of creating a negotiable document for the international transport of goods by rail, in particular for transport subject to the provisions of the Berne Convention.† It asked them to examine in the most favourable spirit the resolution adopted on this subject by the Transport Conference, and to take the necessary steps to enable the next Conference for the revision of the Berne Convention to deal with this problem and find an adequate solution.

(b) *Information Concerning Civil Aviation.*‡

Progress in an inquiry instituted by the Transit Organisation into the position as regards the publication or exchange of information on civil aviation was considered by the Council on January 25th.

In May, 1931, the Council gave its instructions regarding this inquiry, at the same time asking the Transit Organisation to prepare for the use of the Disarmament Conference a collection of the provisions in force relating to the publication or exchange of information on non-military aviation. The Transit Organisation prepared a table of information concerning the number of non-military aircraft and the public funds expended on such craft. The table was sent to the Governments invited to the Disarmament Conference with a request to communicate to the Secretary-General the texts of their national laws, multilateral conventions or individual agreements relating to the publication or exchange of information on civil aviation. § It was clearly stated that this information was

requested solely with a view to comparison of the replies. The replies form the basis of the inquiry which the Transit Organisation has just carried out, and which contains a collection of the provisions in force on the exchange or publication of information on non-military aviation forwarded or mentioned by Governments which have replied to the circular.

The Council authorised the Secretary-General to communicate the collection and the results of the inquiry to the Disarmament Conference on the completion of the work.

(c) *Relations between the Transit Organisation and the Universal Postal Union.*¶

The question of the relations between the Transit Organisation and the Universal Postal Union was again considered by the Council at its January session.** On this subject, the Council noted correspondence from the Director of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union and from the Chairman of the Transit Committee showing progress as regards relations between the two bodies. Certain steps have been taken by a special sub-committee, set up by the Air Transport Co-operation Committee, to examine the question of the constitution and operation of a main system of permanent air routes, with a view to preventing any duplication of the work of the two organisations; and the Council expressed its satisfaction at the intention of the Transit Organisation to associate the Universal Postal Union in its future work on postal air transport.

The Council also hoped that, in view of the forthcoming Air Postal Conference, to be convened by the Belgian Government, the Governments concerned would make arrangements for the Transit Organisation to be invited to send observers to the Conference.

The rapporteur said that in this way the relations between the Universal Postal Union and the Transit Organisation would become as friendly and valuable as those between the Transit Organisation and a large number of other transit organisations, notably the Telegraphic Union.

V.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

1. ADJUSTMENT OF THE WORK OF THE ORGANISATION AND COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.¶

In January, 1931, the Council renewed one

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, page 296.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 11 page 313.

‡ Rapporteur: the Spanish representative.

§ Governments were asked to state whether they would be able to furnish regularly all or part of the particulars given in the table.

¶ Rapporteur: the French representative.

third of the members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, the renewal of another third being due to take place between January, 1932, and June, 1932.

The rapporteur having pointed out that, in view of the financial restrictions dictated by the Twelfth Assembly, it would be desirable

¶ Rapporteur: the Polish representative.

** See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 239.

not to modify the present composition of the Committee, the Council decided to postpone until September, 1932, the renewal of the second third (of the members whose term of office dates from 1926) in order that the members at present in office might be able to pursue the work, while adapting it to the necessities of the moment.

What the Council would wish the Committee to do is to furnish such indications as would facilitate the work of those organs of the League whose duty it is to effect economies. Such economies may apparently be achieved not so much by reducing the work as by ensuring better results from what already exists and has to be maintained. The Assembly intended the restrictions made in the budget for intellectual co-operation to be temporary. The Committees proposals should be of the same nature.

2. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CINEMATOGRAPHIC INSTITUTE.†

On January 26th the Council noted the annual report of the Governing Body of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute.

The report explains that film production and the use of films for educational purposes have developed to such an extent during the last few years that the Institute is constantly becoming aware of fresh opportunities of co-operation. The rôle of educational films in the employment of workers' spare time, their use in the sphere of public health, are the principal questions which will be studied during the coming year. The Institute will pursue its inquiry with regard to film copyright.

VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. DANZIG.*

The question of the Danzig-Polish relations came before the Council in two of its aspects: the access to or anchorage in the Port of Danzig of Polish war vessels, and the use by Poland of the port of Danzig.†

As regards the first, the Council had before it the advisory opinion of the Permanent Court on the question:

"Do the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, Part III., Section XI., the Danzig-Polish Treaty concluded at Paris on November 9th, 1920, and the relevant decisions of the Council of the League of Nations and of the High Commissioner confer upon Poland rights or attributions as regards the access to or anchorage in the port and waterways of Danzig or Polish war vessels? If so, what are these rights or attributions?"

to which the Court, by eleven votes to three, replied in the negative. It had also communications from the Polish and Danzig Governments.

The Polish Foreign Minister, referring to certain passages in the preamble to the advisory opinion, to the effect that no final and definitive decision had ever yet been taken as regards the question of providing shelter and harbour facilities for the vessels of the Polish fleet, requested the Council to examine these questions with a view to final settlement in order that Polish war vessels and vessels other than merchantmen might be accorded harbour facilities and that their nautical requirements might be assured.

Referring to this communication, the President of Danzig Senate observed that the Court's opinion had finally cleared up the legal position. As regards the practical side of the question, international usages with regard to access to and anchorage in foreign ports already assured for Polish war vessels all desirable facilities for victualling and repairs in Danzig and transit through Danzig waters. The Danzig Government now formally repeated its offer to grant Polish warships further special facilities based on local circumstances. The Danzig Government's instructions regarding the application of the international rules expressly provided for the possibility of applying special regulations to the warships of individual States. The Danzig Government stated that, when the matter had been settled before the Council, it would invite the Polish authorities to state their wishes regarding special facilities before March 1st. It was willing to prolong the provisional regulations issued by the High Commissioner on September 19th, 1931, to April 1st, 1932, but these regulations would automatically lapse on that date.

On January 28th the Polish Government accepted the proposals of the President of the Danzig Senate, making, however, every reservation as regards the decree mentioned in the Senate's letter since, in its opinion, regulations defining the rules for the mooring and anchorage of foreign war vessels in the Port of Danzig should only be drawn up with the assistance of the Port and Waterways Board, the Polish

* Rapporteur: the British representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 245.

‡ Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

Government and, if necessary, the League organs.

The Council adopted the advisory opinion of the Court, and requested the Secretary-General to communicate the text to the High Commissioner. It expressed the opinion that, in view of the fact that the legal points upon which a divergence of views between the parties had been revealed had now been elucidated, the practical questions raised by the Polish Government should be settled directly between the parties. It noted with satisfaction statements made by both Governments and the fact that the question might thus be finally settled.

The second question, the use of the port of Danzig by Poland, had been examined in the spring of 1931 by a special committee of jurists.* Basing his action on the findings of this body, the High Commissioner had given a decision dated October 26th, 1931, from which both the Polish and Danzig Governments had appealed. In these circumstances the Council decided to request the Committee of Jurists which examined the question in 1931 to consider certain fresh legal questions raised in the appeals and to give its opinion in time to enable the Council to examine it at its May session.

The rapporteur expressed the hope that after this supplementary examination of the question a practical solution of the question might be found by direct negotiations between the parties.

2. THE SAAR: APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING COMMISSION.†

The term of office of the present members of the Saar Governing Commission being due to expire on March 31st, 1932, the Council made the following appointments for a period of one year, as from April 1st, 1932:

M. D'Ehmrooth (Finnish).

M. Kossmann (Saar).

Mr. Knox (British) (Chairman).

M. Morize (French).

M. Zoricic (Yugoslav).

Sir Ernest Wilton (British) and M. Vezensky (Czechoslovak) having declined the renewal of their appointment, the Council thanked them for the services they had rendered the League.

3. MANDATES.

(a) *Work of the Commission.*

The report of the Mandates Commission on its twenty-first session was considered by the Council on January 25th.‡

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 2, page 50.

† Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, page 209

The Council noted the annual reports of the Mandatory Powers, as well as the report and the minutes of the Commission and, on the proposal of the Yugoslav representative, decided to communicate the Commission's observations to the Governments concerned, asking them to take the necessary action thereon.

The Council approved the conclusions of the Commission with regard to the petitions examined by it, and instructed the Secretary-General in each case to communicate them to the Mandatory and to the petitioners concerned.

The 1931 Assembly having decided, on grounds of economy, to reduce the number of sessions of the Commission from two to one in 1932, the Commission felt bound to draw the Council's attention to the fact that, if this decision were maintained or renewed, it might be absolutely unable to fulfil its duties under Article 22 of the Covenant and the whole mandates system would be prevented from working in an effective and regular manner. The Council decided to bring these observations to the notice of the Assembly and the Supervisory Commission.

On this occasion several members of the Council expressed the hope that the Commission would be able to pursue its work despite the financial difficulties. The Secretary-General recalled that the decision of the Assembly was a purely exceptional measure which had appeared inevitable in view of the financial situation.

(b) *Termination of the Mandate in Iraq.*

The opinion of the Mandates Commission with regard to the termination of the mandatory régime in Iraq was considered by the Council on January 28th.

The rapporteur recalled that it could not pronounce the termination of the Mandate in Iraq without making it conditional upon the admission of that country to the League; it will be remembered that, on December 16th, 1925, when the Council defined the frontier between Turkey and Iraq, the execution of this decision was made conditional upon the prolongation for twenty-five years of the mandatory régime in Iraq, subject to the reservation that Iraq might, before the termination of that period, be admitted to the League in conformity with Article 1 of the Covenant.

On the proposal of its rapporteur, the Yugoslav representative, the Council noted the opinion of the Commission. It considered that the information available was sufficient to show that Iraq satisfied, generally speaking, the *de*

facto conditions formulated in the Council resolution of September, 1931. It declared itself in principle prepared to pronounce the termination of the mandatory régime in Iraq when that State should have entered into undertakings before the Council in conformity with the suggestions contained in the report of the Mandates Commission, it being understood that the right to apply to the Permanent Court might only be exercised by Members of the Council and not by any Member of the League, as contemplated by the Commission.

The rapporteurs on minorities, international law and mandates, and the British representative on the Council, in consultation with the representative of the Iraq Government, and, if necessary, with a representative of the Mandates Commission, were asked to submit to the Council at its next session draft declarations bearing upon the various guarantees recommended in the report of the Mandates Commission. The Council decided that if, after noting the undertakings to be given by Iraq, it should approve the termination of the mandate régime in this territory, this decision should only take effect from the date of Iraq's admission to the League.

The Italian representative, M. Rosso, said that the Italian Government was of opinion that, in the specific case it was possible to accept without having recourse to other sources of information the Mandates Commission's assumption that Iraq satisfied the necessary conditions for the termination of the mandate.

The Italian Government considered that the moral condition and internal policy of Iraq, the degree of efficiency reached by her administration, the spirit in which her laws were applied and in which her institutions functioned had been tested in the light of experience acquired over a period of more than ten years. He thought that account must also be taken of the fact that Iraq was organised at the beginning of the mandatory régime with all the powers and functions of an independent State, and that the method adopted by the Mandatory made it possible for its own control to be progressively reduced. Hence the Iraq Government had been able to exercise and freely develop its capacities, with the result that, in the opinion of the Italian Government, the Council was here and now in a position to state that Iraq had arrived at maturity and to assume responsibility for the declaration which could terminate the mandate. Examining the *de facto* conditions to be fulfilled by Iraq, the Italian representative pointed out that the ability of a State to defend itself against external aggression could not be regarded

absolutely, as obviously no State could be deemed capable in every case of defending itself against external aggression. The solution of the problem of security must be sought elsewhere, namely, in the participation of the new State in the League of Nations, and in the guarantees of integrity and independence which such participation ensured.

As regards judicial guarantees, the Italian Government hoped that the undertakings to be given by Iraq would be based on the provisions of the Anglo-Iraq Judicial Agreement now in force, but subject to suitable modifications with a view to admitting nationals of different states among the foreign judges, members of the Iraq judiciary.

The Italian Government considered that certain of the undertakings given by Iraq to Great Britain under the Treaty of Alliance of June 30th, 1930, reached the extreme limit compatible with the status of an independent state; but it recognised that the character of these undertakings might be explained by reference to the particular situation of Iraq at an important junction in the great international air lines.

The Italian representative concluded by congratulating the new State, which was on the eve of acquiring full sovereignty and independence.

Lord Cecil stated that, in the British Government's opinion, Iraq was now capable of standing by herself, and the British representative thought that the greatest possible generosity should be shown in giving her full responsibility.

Speaking of minorities, the British representative pointed out that the history of Iraq had been essentially one of religious tolerance; he agreed, however, that it was quite necessary that appropriate guarantees should be required.

As regards the question of the commercial system, the British Government had no objection to the proposal that Iraq should be required to grant most-favoured-nation treatment to all States Members on the basis of reciprocity. Lord Cecil trusted that the Special Committee instructed to draft the declarations which Iraq should make before the Council would consider very carefully how long that arrangement should endure. In his opinion, two years would be sufficient. On this occasion Lord Cecil drew attention to the special case of the customs agreements that might be concluded between Iraq and Turkey or other ex-Ottoman States and the establishment of a frontier customs zone. The right to make special agreements of this character was, he said, already recognised in the Lausanne Commercial

Convention and in certain of the Middle East Mandates. He was convinced that the Council would not wish to withdraw that right at the present time. As for the judicial organisation, the British Government did not desire to contest in any way the principle of the eligibility of non-British candidates for admission to the foreign judiciary of Iraq after the termination of the mandatory régime, but he would protest against any arrangement that would limit Iraq's full freedom to choose these judges.

The Norwegian representative, M. Colban, recalled that, ten years ago, Lord Balfour had warned the Council against the danger of the League undertaking duties which it might perhaps not be entirely capable of fulfilling. He was glad that the adaptation to Iraq of minority rules applied in other countries would be considered; but this precaution alone would not have satisfied him. He thanked Lord Cecil for his statement, because the best guarantee for minorities was obviously to be found in the attitude of mind of the various races living together. If that attitude was not satisfactory, he would feel doubtful as to the usefulness of a legal system for the protection of minorities.

The rapporteur, M. Marinkovitch, pointed out that he had not accepted all the conditions put forward by the Commission, in particular those concerning the military defence of a State's independence. All that was necessary was that a State should, like any other State, be capable of defending its independence.

As regards the judicial organisation, the rapporteur pointed out that the Commission merely wished to give Iraq complete freedom in choosing judges from any nation. Replying to Lord Cecil on the subject of the most-favoured-nation clause, he observed that it had been impossible to find any other basis for Iraq's commercial régime. He was convinced that no State would profit by the clause to hamper Iraq's commercial development. The period of two years proposed by Lord Cecil seemed to him too short.

The German representative, M. von Weizsäcker, noted with satisfaction that the Commission had realised the importance of the problem of minorities.

The President associated himself with a vote of thanks to the Commission. Speaking as French representative, he recalled that his country was faced with problems similar to those which the British Government had had to solve. A Mandatory Power's first task was to develop the administrative and political capacity of the mandated territory in order to enable the Council to pronounce the termina-

tion of the Mandate. The French representative recalled that his Government's views had already been set forth at the Council meeting of September 4th, 1931, on the first occasion on which the Council had been called upon to apply to one of the mandated countries in the Near East the rules laid down in its resolution. He associated himself with the opinion expressed by the rapporteur with regard to Iraq's ability to defend herself. He also shared the view of the Commission with regard to the compatibility of the Anglo-Iraq Treaty of Alliance with Iraq's independence. He appreciated the very careful way in which the Commission had examined the question of the rights of minorities, which must be scrupulously safeguarded, although methods might vary according to local circumstances.

As regards the judicial organisation, the French representative considered that the prolongation of the system laid down in the last Anglo-Iraq Judicial Agreement would be entirely satisfactory, and he wished to say that the presence of English judges in the Iraq courts would afford all the necessary guarantees for French nationals.

In conclusion, he stated that, in undertaking engagements for a specified period, a country to be emancipated from the Mandate would only be consolidating its independence if it continued to enjoy the foreign assistance in various matters which had done so much for the intellectual and material development of countries in the Levant. In this way it would be preparing for the full attainment of its independence, since the guarantees which would accompany the termination of the mandate would obviously have a decisive effect on the decision of the Assembly, to which belonged the sovereign right of deciding upon the admission of States to the League.

The President of the Mandates Commission, Marquis Theodoli, who took part in the debate, explained why the Commission had recommended that all members of the League should be entitled to bring before the Court differences relating to Iraq's undertakings. He added that he would not insist on the Commission's point of view in this respect.

*Accession of Iraq to the International Convention on Customs Formalities.**

The Council decided to transmit to the Iraq Government the text of the Convention on Customs Formalities (Geneva, November 3rd, 1923), and thus enable it to accede to the Convention.

* Rapporteur: the German representative.

(c) *The Syrian, Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan Frontier.**

The Council considered a joint request from the British and French Governments to approve the provisions of an Agreement concerning the Syrian, Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan frontier.

This frontier line was defined in an agreement signed by the two Mandatory Powers on October 31st, 1931. At the Council meeting the rapporteur recalled that the boundary between the territories detached from the former Ottoman Empire and placed under the British and French mandates was defined in the Franco-British Convention of December 23rd, 1920, which was registered with the Secretariat on February 6th, 1924.

The first section of the frontier thus determined, *i.e.*, the Syria-Palestine section, formed the object of a Protocol concerning the boundary line, which was ratified by the two Mandatories in 1923.

The question of the Syria-Iraq frontier was dealt with by the Council at the meeting held in Paris in December, 1931, when it decided to set up a Commission to collect on the spot the necessary information and elements of appreciation.

When submitting to the Council last November the question of the delimitation of the frontier between Syria and Iraq the British and French Governments stated that, as regards the Syrian-Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan section they had reached agreement.

On January 30th, after a discussion between the British, French, and Italian representatives, the Council decided to comply with the request of the two Mandatory Powers and to approve the Agreement. The rapporteur pointed out that the modifications which the two Governments had made in the provisions had been inspired by the desire not to disturb the populations in the exercise of their rights and customs, to increase security by facilitating administration, and to ensure, in the present and in the future, the security of the vital communications between Iraq and Trans-Jordan towards the Mediterranean.

The new frontier will be delimited on the ground.

* * *

The Italian representative, M. Rosso, pointed out that, as the report had only been circulated that morning, he had not yet been able to form an opinion on the subject. He could have wished that the Mandates Commission, the Council's advisory organ for these questions,

should give its opinion and should state whether the Agreement was genuinely in the interests of the two territories under mandate. The Italian representative was convinced that the Agreement was an excellent one, but wondered on what basis the Council could express its opinion. He was far from wishing to create difficulties for the two mandatories or to delay the application of certain measures which were in the interests of the two populations.

The British representative, Lord Cecil, recalled that this was not the first occasion on which the matter had been before the Council and that, last December, it had decided in principle that it was desirable to fix the frontier between the two territories. The Mandates Commission had held the same view, and for about ten years had addressed urgent appeals to the British and French Governments to settle the matter, in view of the obvious disadvantages of an undefined frontier.

The British representative had later notified the settlement of the question to the Mandates Commission, which could have examined the whole problem had it so desired. In principle, Lord Cecil agreed with the Italian representative that, before any alteration was made in a frontier, it should be examined by the Mandates Commission, but in this particular case he hoped that the Council would not adjourn the matter further, otherwise it would not be settled before September.

The French representative associated himself with Lord Cecil's words.

The Italian representative having observed that if the Protocol between the two parties had been communicated to the Mandates Commission it would not have been necessary to ask for information first, and that there had not been time to examine the report, the British representative again reminded him that the Council had approved the proposal in principle, that the frontier between the two districts had been constantly discussed in the Commission for ten years and that, last October, the British representative had informed the Commission that the frontier had been fixed. The Italian representative drew attention to the fact that, at its last session, the Council had chiefly dealt with the question of the frontier between Syria and Iraq, and had decided that it should be settled through the League. The problem they were now discussing had been mentioned, but the Council had not gone into details. In conclusion, the Italian representative declared that he had confidence in the mandatories, but would be glad if the Council would affirm the principle that it had

* Rapporteur: the Yugoslav representative.

no authority to pronounce judgment in such matters and that, as a general rule, it was for its advisory body to examine the question previously. He accordingly submitted the following draft resolution :

" The Council,

Considering that in their Agreement of October 31st, 1931, Great Britain and France have drawn up a frontier line which the Council has every reason to believe to be in the interests of the populations under mandate ;

Considering that in these circumstances and in view of the importance of an immediate settlement of the question it does not seem essential to refer the matter to the Permanent Mandates Commission whose opinion in other circumstances it would certainly have asked ;

In response to the joint request of the British and French Governments ;

Approves the Agreement of October 31st, 1931, regarding the Syria, Jebel-Druse-Trans-Jordan frontier."

The French representative and the rapporteur agreed to the modifications proposed by the Italian representative to the original resolution. The British representative also accepted the proposal. He drew attention to the fact that the formal approval of the Council had never been sought for the western section of the frontier dividing Syria and the Lebanon from Palestine, which was delimited in 1923. His Government would examine this question in consultation with the French Government and, if any necessary measures had been overlooked, appropriate action would be taken in agreement with the French Government to remedy the omission at a future session of the Council.

The French representative associated himself with this statement, and the Council adopted the draft resolution as amended by the Italian representative.

VII.—PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

I. THE UKRANIAN MINORITY IN POLAND.

This question was first brought before the Council at its September session by the British, Norwegian, and Italian representatives, members of the Minorities Committee which, in conformity with the existing procedure, had examined a number of petitions on the subject and the observations of the Polish Government.

To give the rapporteur time to draw up his report, the Council pronounced the adjournment of the question until its January session.*

At this session the rapporteur submitted a report in which he presented what he considered as the essential points, grouped systematically, which the Council would have to take into consideration if it were to arrive at a solution of this difficult and delicate problem. Some of the petitions concerned referred to events which took place in the voivodies of Lwow, Stanisławów, and Tarnopol during the summer and autumn of 1930, and related to a number of cases in which the Ukrainian population is alleged to have been treated by the Polish authorities in a manner contrary to the provisions of the Polish Minorities Treaty concerning the protection of life and property and equality of treatment in law, and, in fact, as between majority and minority. Other petitions deal respectively with the case of the closing of the Ukrainian Gymnasium at Rohatyn, with the treatment to which former Ukrainian deputies are alleged to have been subjected in prison, with school questions, the exercise of electoral rights, and with distribution

of land. The documentation submitted to the Council also contained the Polish Government's observations which included information regarding the general economic development of the three voivodies, together with data concerning the co-operative movement among the Ukrainian population before and after the war. After considering the documentation, the rapporteur submitted conclusions which may be summarised as follows :

He proposed that the Council should confirm and endorse the Polish Government's contention as regards the danger of allowing the system for the protection of minorities by the League of Nations to be utilised for the purpose of malicious propaganda against a state by means of false and misleading allegations. The study he had made of the documentation concerning the question led him to believe that not all the documents relating thereto can be regarded as above suspicion from this point of view.

The detailed particulars communicated by the Polish Government with regard to the general situation of the Ukrainian minority seemed to the rapporteur to dispose of the idea that the Polish Government had any intention of pursuing a systematic policy of oppression and violence towards the Ukrainian minority. This consideration seemed of particular importance, because it made it possible to appreciate the true value to be attributed to the concrete facts.

An examination of the documents submitted to the Council showed that a terrorist and revolutionary campaign was initiated in the

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 6, page 246.

territory of Eastern Galicia, notably during the summer of 1930, by certain Ukrainian nationalist organisations. The Council would, he thought, no doubt wish to express its explicit and formal condemnation of any endeavour, whatever its origin, to ensure respect for the rights of a minority population by violence and terror.

As regards the numerous facts dealt with in the different petitions, it was impossible not to remark signs of a situation which, although temporary, was certainly not in keeping with the guarantees which it was desired to set up in favour of minorities by instituting the system of protection by the League. The reprehensible origins of such a situation could not justify, on the part of the authorities, conduct such as that revealed in the information before the Council. The rapporteur added that the Polish Government itself, realising its responsibility and anxious to protect effectively its true interests, had duly taken disciplinary action which would no doubt help to prevent the renewal of such events.

The rapporteur, however, regretted that the Polish Government had not felt able to grant compensation to the innocent elements of the population which had been victims of abuses.

In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Polish Government would maintain its line of conduct with the necessary tenacity, and that the policy of conciliation which it proposed would arouse among the population concerned and its authorised representatives a comprehension inspired by a sincere spirit of loyalty, this being an essential condition if this policy were to bear the anticipated fruit.

The presentation of the report was followed by statements by several members of the Council. The Irish representative expressed his gratification at the prospect of an improvement in a situation which the petitions of the minority and the statements of the Polish Government showed to have been an unhappy one.

Speaking as Chairman of the Committee which had placed this matter on the agenda, Lord Cecil drew attention to the interest which the question had excited in his own country. Some of the facts mentioned in the report were very regrettable, and he shared the rapporteur's regret that the Polish Government had been unable to grant compensation to the innocent members of the population who had been the victims of abuses. He was very glad that the Polish Government had taken disciplinary and other measures against the guilty persons, and hoped that it would reconsider

the question and see whether something could not be done to help the sufferers.

Lord Cecil also hoped that the Polish Government would energetically proceed with measures of reconciliation and appeasement which would lead to the disappearance of the difficulties.

In conclusion, he mentioned two petitions referring to allegations of ill-treatment in prisons, which he hoped were exaggerated, if not fictitious. He expressed his regret that these matters could not be investigated and reported upon.

The Norwegian representative, M. Colban, realised the complexity of the problem, together with the many difficulties with which the Polish Government was faced. It was essential, he said, that in these provinces the majority and the minority should gradually be reconciled, and he believed that, if this were to be brought about, the Polish Government would have to pursue with energy and perseverance the policy outlined in its statements. He shared the regrets of the rapporteur and the British representative that it had not been possible to compensate the victims.

The German representative M. von Weizsäcker, drew the attention to the interest taken by the public in this matter; it would no doubt carefully examine the report before the Council. He associated himself with the expectations concerning the future protection of the minorities to which the Members of the Council had given expression.

The Polish representative, M. Zaleski, accepted the report in the name of his Government. Replying to the British representative, he expressed the hope that Lord Cecil would not confine himself to a thorough study of the report, but would look further and give a thought to the general situation resulting from the irresponsible activities of terrorist sections of the population. As representative of an Empire whose possessions were scattered all over the globe, Lord Cecil was better qualified than anybody to appreciate how painful and urgent might sometimes be the duties of a Government anxious to defend the interests committed to its care.

Replying to Lord Cecil's suggestion relating to the possibility of drafting a new report on certain conditions existing in Poland, the rapporteur pointed out that his conclusions had been drawn from material supplied by the Polish Government, and that he failed to see what purpose a new report could serve. He thought that the matter should be allowed to rest where it was.

2. MINORITIES IN UPPER SILESIA.

(a) *Petition from the Prince of Pless.*

At this session the Council declared closed its examination of a petition from the Prince of Pless concerning the situation with regard to his father's property in Silesia, Poland, and expressed the view that the measures mentioned in the note from the Polish Government of January 6th, 1932, as having been taken in regard to this petition, might be considered as a satisfactory settlement of the case.

This question had been before the Council since January, 1931.* On three occasions, in January, May, and September, the Council decided to adjourn its examination, in the hope that the conversations between the Polish authorities and the petitioner would lead to a friendly solution.

Broadly speaking, the petition concerns pressure alleged to have been exercised by the Polish authorities with a view to the ultimate Polonisation of the undertakings in question, which employ a staff of approximately eight hundred employees and seven thousand workers, 85 per cent. of whom are Polish nationals, and the majority of whom probably belong to the German minority. The two matters which are more specifically referred to in the petition are the curtailment of the share of the Pless mines in the coal deliveries for the State Railways and fiscal measures alleged to have been taken against the management.

As regards the first question, the petitioner explained that this curtailment was effected in violation of the collective agreements between the State and the Coal Syndicates, whereas the Polish Government stated in its observations that orders for coal had been reduced in April, 1930, for all Silesian undertakings. The reduction of the monthly quota (by about two-ninths of the daily output) had been decided on purely economic grounds, and could not seriously affect the economic stability of the undertakings.

As regards fiscal measures, the petitioner observed that fiscal decisions on the returns for the years 1925-1929 had only been passed in 1930, and that the discrepancy between the amount at which the tax had been assessed and that which had been expected by the management resulted from an ill-founded application of the special procedure laid down in cases of default, in the course of which, moreover, certain particular points concerning the situation of the management had not been

taken into consideration. In reply, the Polish Government stated that the fiscal procedure established in regard to the taxes to be paid by the property of the Prince of Pless for the period 1925-1930 was entirely in accordance with the laws and provisions in force, and came within the scope of a general measure of verification and supervision of taxation. Further, the decisions of the fiscal authority were subject to appeal which, in the last resort, might be carried to the Supreme Administrative Court. The Polish Government considered that intervention by the Council before the normal remedies had been exhausted would place the petitioner in a privileged position compared with that of citizens of Polish nationality.

Further communications from the Polish Government stated that the examination of the question was being conducted with the utmost consideration for the interested party, that the time-limits for the payment of the taxes had been extended, and that certain decisions of the commission of inquiry appointed to examine the question of the Prince of Pless' income tax for the years 1925-1929 had been annulled.

The petitioner having observed that, in view of the sums due and paid as income tax, the management had a credit of one quarter of a million zloty with the Polish Treasury, and that the annulment of the decisions of this commission of inquiry was not such as to give him satisfaction as long as the decisions of the assessment commission fixing the amount of the tax were not annulled, the rapporteur expressed the view that the annulment of the decisions of the commission of appeal must be regarded as implying the complete and final annulment of all the measures taken by the finance administration in connection with the fixing of the tax, and that this explanation seemed to offer all the reassurance that the petitioner could desire.

Both the Polish and German representatives stated that they accepted the findings of the report. The German representative reserved the right to revert, if necessary, to the question of the compatibility of the assessment commission's decisions with the provisions relating to the protection of minorities.

(b) *Petitions from M. Leon Plonka, of Baumgarten, and the "Caritasverband," of Breslau, concerning the Personal Situation of the Former.*

In view of the fact that, in the opinion of the German and Polish Governments, the petitioner should be considered a Polish national, the Council considered that his case did not concern

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 1, page 24 and No. 5, page 140.

the protection of minorities in German Upper Silesia.

On the rapporteur's proposal it noted the situation and closed its examination of the question.

3. PROTECTION OF MINORITIES IN ROUMANIA.*

The question of the property of the descendants of the former Szekler (Hungarian) frontier guard regiment, which was considered by the Council at this session, had already appeared on the Council's agenda in May and September, 1931.†

At its earlier sessions, the Council had deferred consideration of the matter to give the Roumanian Government an opportunity of settling the question by direct negotiations with the petitioners, which have not, however, led to any definite results.

The property which, according to the petitioners, belongs to the community composed of descendants of the Szekler frontier guard regiment, is alleged to have been taken over by the Roumanian Government without the payment of any compensation whatsoever. On the other hand, properties which, according to the petitioners, occupied an identical position, but which belonged to descendants of two Roumanian regiments, are stated to have been maintained in their previous position in virtue of explicit legislative provisions and special arrangements. The essential point was, according to the rapporteur, whether this action could be regarded as discriminatory treatment in violation of the clause providing for equal

treatment in law and in fact of the Roumanian Minorities Treaty.

The Roumanian Government maintained that, from the legal standpoint, there was a fundamental difference between the position of the properties of the regiments mentioned. The property of the Roumanian regiments belonged to their descendants in full ownership, whereas that of the Hungarian regiment belonged to the Hungarian Government, the whole population of the Comitatus of Ciuc, including the descendants of the members of the Hungarian regiment, having enjoyed only the usufruct of that property. The Roumanian Government, moreover, expressed the opinion that the question of the proprietary rights over the property concerned fell within the sole jurisdiction of the Roumanian Courts, and that the petitioners were obliged to employ the legal channels of the country which were always open to the petitioners before applying to the League. The conclusion to be reached by the Council on the question of equality of treatment would depend on whether the legal status of the properties belonging to the two Roumanian regiments and to the Hungarian regiment was found to be different or not.

After expressing the view that this preliminary question should, in principle, have been referred to the Permanent Court for an advisory opinion, the Council, in view of certain practical considerations, decided to refer it to a committee of jurists and requested its President to appoint, together with the rapporteur, the members of this Committee.

VIII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The Council resumed its examination of the appeal of the Chinese Government under Article 11 of the Covenant on January 25th, the opening day of its sixty-sixth session.

The President, M. Paul-Boncour, recalled that on December 10th the Council had unanimously decided to create a commission to study on the spot and report to the Council any circumstances which, being calculated to affect international relations, might disturb the peace between China and Japan or the good understanding between the two nations upon which peace depends.*

He added that although, with the exception of a citizen of the United States, the Commission

consisted entirely of nationals of Powers permanently represented on the Council, the course followed in this particular case should not in any way be regarded as implying the deliberate adoption by the Council of a procedure which would place the settlement of certain matters exclusively in the hands of its permanent members. This Commission had held a preliminary meeting at Geneva on January 21st. General MacCoy, the American member, had been unable to attend in person, but was represented by the American Consul at Geneva. The Commission had elected Lord Lytton as president, and had decided to leave for the Far East at the beginning of February.

M. Yen (China) said that the Japanese Government had not carried out the undertakings it had entered into by the resolutions of September 30th and December 10th. During

* Rapporteur: the Japanese representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 5, page 141 and No. 9, page 246.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 12, page 337.

the six weeks which had elapsed since the latter date, the menace to peace had increased owing to advances of Japanese forces hundreds of miles beyond the positions they occupied when the Council last met. The Commission of Inquiry had not yet left, and it had been stated that, when it did leave, it would not arrive in Manchuria before April at the latest. The Chinese Government had hoped that it would have been possible to arrive at a settlement of the dispute within the framework of Article 11, but it was daily becoming more urgent for it to exhaust its rights under the other articles of the Covenant. Moreover, the crisis did not merely concern China, but put in the gravest jeopardy the entire conception of the settlement of international disputes by pacific means. Mr. Yen concluded that it was incumbent upon the Council to see that its resolutions were executed without any further delay.

M. Sato (Japan) said that there were, at the most, 25,000 Japanese soldiers in Manchuria and that it was, therefore, impossible to say that the whole territory was entirely occupied by Japanese forces. He described the events which had taken place in the region of Chinchow. On December 20th the Japanese military authorities had undertaken an expedition on a large scale against the forces of disorder in the district of Liao. The occupation of Chinchow was geographically and strategically a logical and essential measure for the proper accomplishment of this task. Order was now being maintained in this region. If the Japanese Government had been unable to withdraw its troops into the railway zone as promptly as it would have desired, this was because the Japanese forces had been obliged to undertake operations for clearing the territory, and these operations had had to be completed.

Speaking of the situation at Shanghai, to which M. Yen had referred, M. Sato recognised that it was most critical, but denied that the responsibility lay with his Government. A hostile agitation directed against Japan was, he said, being carried on in China under the Government's direction. This agitation was at present directed against Japan, but was also of an anti-foreign character, and other Powers had suffered from it or would suffer in future. Japanese nationals, even in remote provinces of China, had had to flee in haste. Food had been refused them, and they had suffered enormous losses. Recently attacks had become more violent, endangering the very lives of Japanese nationals. At Shanghai, Japanese monks had been attacked and nearly killed by a Chinese crowd. An attempt had been made

to set fire to the residence of the Japanese Minister in China and, on the occasion of the recent attempt against the life of the Japanese Emperor one newspaper, an organ of the Shanghai Nationalist Party, had even gone so far as to express regret that another carriage only had been damaged. The Japanese Government could not allow its nationals to be molested. While 'prepared, in accordance with law, to punish severely any of its own nationals guilty of illegal acts, it must again insist that the Chinese authorities take speedy and effective measures to remedy the present state of affairs.

The Japanese representative recalled that all the Powers had stationed warships not only before Shanghai, but also in the rivers in the interior of China.

Speaking of Manchuria, the Japanese representative said that it was absolutely essential for Japan's existence that her rights and interests in that territory should be respected, and that her nationals should be able to work in peace and safety. For years Japan had borne with incredible patience innumerable vexations and acts of provocation. Certain incidents, including those of September 18th, had brought to its highest point the irritation of the Japanese people, which was unanimous in demanding that its rights should be safeguarded. M. Sato then quoted the speech made in the Tokio Parliament on January 21st by the Japanese Foreign Minister, to the effect that "Japan harbours no territorial designs in Manchuria, and she will uphold the principle of the open door and equal opportunity, as well as all existing treaties relating to that territory. What Japan desires is only to secure peace and order for Manchuria, and to make that region safe both for Chinese and foreigners and open to all for economic development."

M. Sato expressed his satisfaction that the Commission of Inquiry had been constituted. In a few months time, after studying the situation on the spot, that body would provide the Council with a very important report for the settlement of the dispute. The Council must wait until its mission had been completed.

M. Yen recalled that the Japanese had, on several occasions, promised not to occupy Chinchow, and that the excuses for the invasion of Manchuria had changed from day to day. After quoting certain points of the statement of the Peruvian representative at the Council meeting on December 10th, he said that it was remarkable that, in view of the aggression of which China had been the victim, more anti-Japanese incidents had not taken place in China. The boycott of which the Japanese Government

complained was a European weapon; no Government in the world could, however, force a people to buy that which they did not wish to buy. The Japanese delegate had stated that his country did not desire to encroach upon the territorial integrity of China, but the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 also required the observance of her administrative integrity.

In conclusion, M. Yen recalled that this was the third time since 1914 that the Japanese had invaded Chinese territory, and that it was no wonder that the Chinese people was exasperated.

Resuming the debate, the President noted that some of the facts brought to the notice of the Council were prior to the resolution of December 10th. In regard to these facts the Council could but abide by its resolution. Other facts, on the contrary, while relating to Manchuria, were subsequent to the adoption of the resolution of December 10th. These included the programme and the itinerary of the Commission of Inquiry. It would be for the Council to decide whether it was materially possible to obviate the delay to which the Chinese representative had drawn attention.

Another group of facts included the incidents which had arisen in the Shanghai district. As a preliminary to any inquiry by the Council, the President had asked the Chinese and Japanese representatives to request their Governments to do all in their power to prevent Shanghai from becoming a new centre of trouble.

The next day exchanges of view took place between the Members of the Council other than the parties. Moreover, information was received from the Chinese and Japanese delegations to the effect that skirmishes had taken place in the suburbs of Shanghai between Chinese and Japanese forces. On January 29th the Chinese representative on the Council addressed the following communication to the Secretary-General:

"Under instructions from my Government, I have the honour hereby to give notice as follows:

1. A dispute between two Members of the League of Nations, to wit: China and Japan, arising from the aggression of the latter against the territorial and administrative integrity and political independence of the former in violation of the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations, exists.

2. This dispute has not been submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement in accordance with any of the Articles of the Covenant.

3. The said dispute has now reached a stage when it is likely to lead to an immediate rupture between China and Japan.

4. China hereby invokes the application (not in derogation of the measures taken, or which may

be taken by the League in the exercise of its functions under Article XI., but in addition thereto) both of Article X. and of Article XV. of the Covenant to said dispute and formally submits the said matter to the Council for all appropriate and necessary action under both of said Articles.

5. For this purpose China begs leave to refer to, and hereby adopts as and for the statement of its case comprising the relevant facts and papers in relation to said matter, all the statements and papers heretofore made and submitted by China in the proceedings of the Council taken in said controversy under Article XI. of the Covenant from September 18th, 1931, to the date hereof.

The Council met in the afternoon of the same day. The Chinese representative's letter was read, and the President drew attention to the exchanges of view which had been taking place since January 25th between members of the Council other than the parties. Following these conversations, a statement had been drafted which the President proposed to read. This statement, he said, affirmed that the resolutions taken on September 30th and December 10th were still valid.

"I would like to point out that when this question was first raised I stated that the Council, in so far as matters which were then before it were concerned, was guided entirely by the resolution adopted on December 10th, and that with regard to those matters no new resolution would be called for at all events until a first report had been received from the Commission of Inquiry that was appointed.

In the statement we had prepared we said that we had no intention of relaxing those continuous efforts which, with the co-operation of the Parties and the invaluable support of the United States we had pursued during the last four months to bring about a just solution as speedily as the complicated nature of the facts permitted. We went on to point out that so long as the present situation remained unchanged, not only was there an incessant threat to the maintenance of peace on the Far East, but that also the feeling of uncertainty and suspense which was inevitably engendered in the minds of the citizens of China and Japan, as well as in those of the foreigners settled in the Far East, would remain unallayed. That situation, we said, was deplorable in itself; deplorable also because it added to the difficulties which are hindering the whole world in its efforts to recover from the present economic depression.

In that depression we ventured to point out to both countries that, entirely irrespective of solemn undertakings which constituted juridical obligations, good relations between states could only be secured by co-operation and mutual respect, and that no permanent solution could be achieved by force, whether military or merely economic, and that the longer the present situation continued, the wider the breach between the two peoples would become and the more difficult the solution would be, with all the disasters that would mean not only the two nations directly involved but the world in general.

We also felt that we ought not to under-estimate the efforts put forth by the League of Nations in this matter and the results that have been achieved by those efforts, and we said in that statement that we derived considerable encouragement and found grounds for hope in the declaration of the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, which declaration was quoted in the Council by the delegate of Japan. The Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs said: "Japan harbours no territorial designs in Manchuria and she will uphold the principles of the open door and equal opportunity, as well as all existing treaties relating to that territory."

We also stated that we were acquainted with the text of the Note addressed to both Governments on January 8th by the Government of the United States, and I may be allowed to express our appreciation of the reference which that Note contains to the confidence of the United States Government that the work of the Commission which has been nominated by the Council will facilitate the solution of the present difficulties. But in that Note the United States Government called the attention of the two parties to the treaties which are binding upon them. For our part, we felt bound to assert in the statement that we had prepared that a settlement of the difficulties between two Governments, Members of the League of Nations, could not be sought in arrangements inconsistent with their international obligations, more especially those arising out of Article 10 of the Covenant, by which they had undertaken to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of all Members of the League, and we concluded the statement which had been prepared in these words: "It would be impossible for the League to endorse a settlement secured by means contrary to the obligations above referred to."

The President then drew attention to the fact that the procedure contemplated under Article 15 must be applied, since one of the parties had invoked this article; this procedure could not, however, prevent the continuation of such efforts for conciliation and prevention as the League might think it desirable to put forth under Article 11.

M. Yen said that the territorial and administrative integrity of China had been destroyed, and her political independence gravely threatened. The obligations specified under Article 10 of the Covenant had, therefore, become operative. It was accordingly for the Council to arrange for the observance of this obligation.

M. Sato regretted that it was impossible for the Council to close its session with the reading of the statement prepared by the President. He then submitted information regarding the situation at Shanghai. The decision to land at Shanghai had not been taken by the Japanese marines, but by a council of the commanders of the foreign naval forces which had assigned to each nation the zone it would be called upon to protect. Following

this decision, the Japanese commanding officers had landed a detachment of marine rifles, which had been attacked by Chinese troops. This was the incident which had caused the Chinese delegation to invoke Article 15 of the Covenant.

As regards Article 10, M. Sato explained that Japan had not submitted this conflict to arbitration because Japan was not prepared to accept arbitration with every country irrespectively. It was for this reason that Japan had hitherto been unable to accede to Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court. As for the accusation brought against Japan with regard to the preserving of the principle of territorial integrity, there had already been similar incidents in the Far East, for example, in 1927.

Passing to the legal point of view, M. Sato noted that the Council had already examined the Sino-Japanese dispute at three meetings under Article 11. If the matter were now to be considered under Article 15, the very basis of the discussion would have to be radically modified. In view of this M. Sato felt bound to express certain doubts. In the first place, as the Council had so far discussed the matter under Article 11, could it now deal with it at the same time under Article 15? Any decision taken by the Council under Article 15 would affect the decision already taken under Article 11. For instance, under Article 15 the Secretary-General could proceed to an inquiry on the spot, but such an inquiry would not be of the same character as those to be undertaken under the resolution of December 10th. M. Sato suggested that it might be advisable to contemplate the postponement of the departure of the Commission of Inquiry until the Council had finally settled the point before it.

The Japanese representative further asked whether, in view of the statement required under Article 15, paragraph 2, China should not submit a fresh statement with all pertinent facts, so that the Council might have a definite basis on which to consider the nature of the dispute brought before it. Again, Article 15 concerned disputes likely to lead to a rupture. Was it quite certain that the Chinese Government intended to proceed to an immediate rupture? The dispute was originally caused by an act of destruction committed by Chinese soldiers against the Japanese railway in Manchuria, so that all measures taken by the Japanese authorities were in the nature of acts of self-protection.

M. Sato finally queried whether, if the existence were admitted of a dispute likely to

lead to a rupture, any Member of the League would be justified in bringing the question before the Council before trying to settle the matter by diplomatic means with the Government concerned. Since September, 1931, the Chinese Government had repeatedly refused to enter into direct negotiations with Japan. M. Sato concluded that the Council had a right to consider whether, in the present case, it was desirable to proceed to the examination of the question under Article 15, and he expressed the opinion that the Council would act wisely if it continued to examine the problem under Article 11.

The President replied to the observations of the Japanese delegate with regard to the procedure. He pointed out that it was not for the Council, when it received a request under Article 15, to decide whether or not it would discuss the matter under that article. This opinion had been given in 1923 by a committee of jurists presided over by M. Adatci, and had subsequently been confirmed by the unanimous decision of the Council on March 13th, 1924.

As regards the question whether procedure taken under Article 15 would automatically cancel procedure under Article 11, the President recalled that the precedents showed that the League had invariably considered that action under Article 15 was not incompatible with measures already taken or to be taken under Article 11.

The report of September 26th, 1927, contained a commentary on Article 11. It had been drawn up in connection with work with which M. Sato himself had collaborated. This report showed that procedure under Article 11 did not exclude procedure under other articles of the Covenant. He was sure that at the present moment when the Council was called upon to consider the matter under Article 15, the Japanese representative would not desire to deprive it of the means of continuing the procedure for prevention and conciliation contemplated under Article 11.

Under the first paragraph of Article 15 the League's first task was to obtain accurate information, and this was more particularly the duty of the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General then read paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 15, and invited the delegations to communicate to him a statement of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, as it could hardly be considered that such a statement was already contained in the documents previously communicated by the Chinese Government.

As regards the information to be obtained in the inquiry to which he would have to proceed, the Secretary-General said that he would most certainly require the assistance of the Members of the Council in securing locally the necessary information. He said that he would formulate definite proposals the next day.

M. Sato repeated that he was not entirely in agreement with the President as regards the interpretation of the report of the Committee of jurists of 1923 and the resolution of 1924. In view of the gravity of the situation, he reserved his right to present further observations.

The President assured the Japanese delegate that the Council would always welcome any observation he might wish to present. On behalf of the Council, he requested the parties to telegraph to their Governments reporting the emotion with which the Council was following the present grave events and stating that it would not terminate its sitting until, in accordance with the Covenant, it had discharged the heavy duties which fell upon it. Meanwhile, he reminded the parties of their duty to do everything to avoid, if possible, any further loss of human life or any acts that might become irreparable.

The Japanese representative replied that he would convey the Council's message to his Government. He would only voice his doubts as to the impression that would be produced in Japan by the new step taken by the Chinese delegation.

M. Yen also said that he would forward the Council's message to his Government.

The next morning, on January 30th, the Secretary-General submitted his proposals to the Council. He asked that the Governments represented on the Council other than the parties to the dispute, which had official representatives at Shanghai, should instruct such officers to form a Committee to send him a report for consideration by the Council on the incidents which had taken place in Shanghai and the environs, as well as their causes and their development.

The Secretary-General added that he would wish to have the possibility of inviting other people holding a similar position to serve on this Committee. For the moment he would not propose any further measures, since it appeared to him that those taken by the Council were sufficient.

M. Yen expressed his satisfaction at the proposal of the Secretary-General, saying that it would be imperative for the Council to go to

the root of the matter and eradicate the source of the evil in Manchuria. The Chinese Government had not invoked Article 15 on account of the Shanghai incidents. Even if these incidents had not taken place, Article 15 would have been invoked. Shanghai was very important for China, but Manchuria was still more important. It was true that, by attacking Shanghai, Japan had also violated Article 10 of the Covenant.

The President, speaking as French representative, M. Rossi (Italy), Lord Cecil (Great Britain), M. von Weizsäcker (Germany), and M. de Zulueta (Spain) stated that their Governments agreed to the proposal of the Secretary-General and that they had accordingly given the necessary instructions to their representatives at Shanghai. The Norwegian representative, M. Colban, said that he had not yet received a reply from his Government.*

M. Sato informed the Council that the Japanese representatives at Shanghai would also afford the Council their assistance. He then submitted several observations.

As regards the infraction of Article 10 alleged by the Chinese representative, he considered that such infraction would occur only in the event of the permanent occupation of the territory of another Power with the idea of remaining in that territory. As stated on several occasions by the Japanese delegates, the Japanese Government had no territorial designs either in Manchuria or in any other part of China. His Government's intentions had not changed, and, as soon as Manchuria had been cleared of undesirable elements, as soon as the lives and property of Japanese subjects were adequately guaranteed, as soon as the possibility of trouble on the Japanese railway line had been removed, the Japanese Government would be able to withdraw its troops within the railway zone. The Japanese Government had been compelled to prolong the delay before proceeding to the withdrawal of its troops, but this did not constitute an infraction of the resolution of December 10th. On that date, moreover, the Council had recognised the Japanese right to self-defence. If, at that moment, it had considered that Japan had infringed Article 10, it would not have allowed her to continue to take action to protect the lives and property of Japanese nationals in Manchuria. The same reasoning applied to the incidents which had occurred at Shanghai.

After giving the Council information in

* This reply, which was affirmative, arrived in the afternoon of January 20th.

regard to recent incidents at Shanghai, M. Sato maintained the opinion he had expressed the day before with regard to the possibility of the Council accepting, without a thorough study, a request from a Member that certain questions should be examined under Article 15, while they were already being considered under Article 11. To his mind, the 1924 report on Article 11 left the Council freedom to decide as to the advisability of applying two procedures simultaneously. M. Sato maintained his doubts as to the advisability of applying both procedures at the present time. Similarly, the opinion of the Committee of Jurists and the resolution of 1927 which had been mentioned merely signified that the Council was not bound to consider whether a dispute was likely to lead to a rupture, but that it had the right to consider this point if it thought it advisable to do so. M. Sato accordingly asked the President to assure him whether the Members of the Council were unanimously determined not to exercise the Council's right under its resolution of 1927.

He thought that a very bad impression might be created in Japan if it were learnt that the Council had taken a decision in such a precipitate way on a question of such extreme importance.

Lord Cecil welcomed the reiteration by his Japanese colleague of his previous declarations that his Government had no territorial designs in Manchuria or elsewhere. He then recalled the discussion which had taken place before the Council on December 10th as regards point 2 of the resolution. It was for the Commission of Inquiry to state whether the measures taken by Japan had been in conformity with the resolution of December 10th. Passing to the juridical matter raised by the Japanese representative, Lord Cecil explained that the duties of the Council and the Secretary-General were quite clear. It was only in cases where a dispute was submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement that the Council could refuse to apply the procedure contemplated under Article 15.

M. Marinkovitch (Yugoslavia) thought that the question raised was very important. Procedure under Article 15 was imperative; the Council could not refuse to deal with a question until it had received the report of the Secretary-General and the statements of the parties. Article 15 even provided that at the request of one of the parties the matter might be brought before the Assembly.

The Japanese nation could be certain that there was no intention to do anything disobliging to it by applying this procedure. At

the same time, since the procedure under Article 11 had not been abandoned, it would be dangerous to confuse the two forms of procedure. The application of an article of the Covenant might, at a given moment, be inconvenient in a particular case, but this was not a reason for abandoning rules which constituted one of the principal and most valuable guarantees of the League.

M. de Zulueta (Spain) agreed to the Secretary-General's proposal, and associated himself with Lord Cecil's and M. Marinkovitch's observations.

M. Sato repeated that he was not sure that Article 15 could operate automatically. Quite recently, when the Council had been discussing a report of the Spanish delegate on a difference between the Finnish and British Governments, he had drawn its attention to a passage in which the rapporteur stated that Article 15 could not apply to the case in point, even though that article had been quoted by one of the parties. If it were true that Article 15 was to be automatically applied as had been stated, it should also have been applied to the dispute considered that morning.

M. Marinkovitch rejoined that he would have raised this question of procedure when the report on the Anglo-Finnish difference was being considered if a Member of the Council had not explained that the Finnish representative had not pressed for the application of that procedure.

M. Sato maintained that procedure under Article 15 should not differ according to the case under consideration, and that Lord Cecil's explanations had not convinced him.

Lord Cecil observed that when a State took its stand on Article 15 it must be prepared to assert that the dispute was likely to lead to a rupture. The Finnish Government had recognised that this was not the case.

Summarising the debate the President noted that the Council had confined itself strictly to interpreting the Covenant. For the moment all that was necessary was to apply the first paragraph of Article 15, by which the Secretary-General was bound to secure immediate information for the Council. This had been done in the present case, thus the first condition of the League's work had been fulfilled.

M. Yen said that his only object was to emphasise that the question of Shanghai should be associated with that of Manchuria. As regards the procedure, he would leave that to the decision of the President.

2. CLAIM OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT AGAINST THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT WITH REGARD TO FINNISH VESSELS USED DURING THE WAR BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.*

The claim of the Finnish Government, which was first brought before the Council in September last,† was, in the interval between the September and January sessions, considered by a committee consisting of the Spanish, Italian, and Norwegian representatives. The preliminary question considered by this committee was whether the Council should examine the dispute submitted to it by the Finnish Government.

The Finnish Government did not base its request on any specific article of the Covenant, but referred to several articles. The Committee accordingly, having examined the articles which might be invoked, finally came to the conclusion that, while it would be difficult to admit that the dispute came within the category of disputes likely to lead to a rupture, within the meaning of Articles 12 and 15, it was possible to consider paragraph 2 of Article 11, which permits of the Council's intervention when a Member of the League, in the exercise of a friendly right, brings to its attention a circumstance which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations.

The Spanish representative, submitting this view, asked that the Council should invite the parties to agree to seek a solution for the two following questions :

(a) Have the Finnish shipowners, or have they not, exhausted the means of recourse placed at their disposal by British law ?

(b) Did the fact that those shipowners had not exhausted the means of recourse in question constitute an obstacle such as to prevent the Finnish Government from claiming compensation from the British Government ?

He suggested that, after examining the parties' communications on the subject, if any point relating to these two questions still remained unsettled, the Council might seek the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion.

The British representative, Lord Cecil, was glad that his colleagues had arrived at the opinion that this was not a case which could properly be dealt with under Article 12 or 15 of the Covenant. As regards Article 11, he did not dispute the theoretical power of the Council to examine the question under that or any other article of the Covenant, but the Council had to consider certain other aspects,

* Rapporteur : the Spanish representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 9, page 249.

in particular how far its power under Article 11 should extend. The Council had always taken the view that Article 11 was intended to cover real international disputes such as involved the higher interests or policy of a country as a whole, and there was no question of policy or principle in the case before the Council, which concerned a private debt, and was not, in Lord Cecil's contention, one which should be dealt with under Article 11.

In the British representative's opinion, the appropriate article under which to proceed was Article 13, which dealt with disputes of a lesser character and suggested a means by which they might be settled, though it did not compel the adoption of those means.

Lord Cecil proposed that the Council should merely note the report and leave it to the Governments concerned to see whether they felt that it suggested any way for a settlement of the dispute. For his part, he had formal instructions not to assent to it being submitted directly or indirectly to arbitration, for the reasons he had given.

The Finnish representative, M. Yrjö Koskinen, pointed out that the problem now under discussion was one of procedure and that, under Article 15, the Council could pronounce upon the report even without the participation of the parties.

The Finnish Government, far from insisting upon arbitration or judicial procedure, would accept any impartial international procedure likely to lead to settlement.

The rapporteur, M. de Madariaga (Spain), noted that the theoretical right of the Council to apply Article 11 was not in dispute, and that this fact had been recognised by the British delegate. He then set forth several cases which seemed to him to resemble the one with which the Council was dealing (the Hungarian optants, the delimitation of the frontier between Poland and Czechoslovakia in the district of Spiez, and the case of the Moslems of Albanian origin in Greece), and in which the League had not hesitated in practice to apply Article 11. The British representative, he added, had stated that the question had aroused no resentment or troublesome reaction between the nations concerned, but it had often happened that in its endeavour to recover a debt or defend a material interest a State had sent troops to another State, had occupied part of the latter's territory, and had prolonged its occupation.

Replying to a further observation of the British representative, the rapporteur denied that the report should be interpreted as suggest-

ing indirect means of inducing a State which had not desired to do so to submit to arbitration. The Committee had suggested that, if the two parties concerned could not reach a direct agreement, the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice should be sought on two definite preliminary questions.

Lord Cecil did not agree with the rapporteur that the three cases cited were similar to that under discussion. The first had excited violent national feeling, the second was a frontier case involving the sovereignty of the parties, and in the third the Council had unanimously expressed the view that Article 11 should only be invoked in grave cases which produce a feeling that facts exist which might inevitably menace the maintenance of peace. He accordingly maintained his request that the Council should either merely note the report or adjourn the discussion till later.

The Italian representative said that the Committee had been faced with a number of cases in all of which the first or second paragraph of Article 11 had been invoked, and there had been no dispute in this connection. The Members of the Committee had found it very difficult to lay down theoretical principles in regard to Article 11 because, from the technical standpoint, it would be very difficult to say that Article 11 could never apply in matters relating to debts. In substance, certain of the cases cited were of a purely economic nature, although naturally political questions might be mixed up with them to some extent. In this case the Committee had endeavoured to determine the possible scope of the Council's action. It had drawn a very clear distinction between that which the Council might take under other articles, considered as inapplicable, and the conciliatory action which it might take under Article 11. In view of certain difficulties, the parties had been asked to endeavour to reach a preliminary agreement upon specific questions as, otherwise, it would be impossible for them to resume diplomatic negotiations on the substance of the matter.

The Japanese representative drew the Council's attention to the passage in the report to the effect that one of the parties had invoked several articles of the Covenant, but that the Committee had thought it possible, and even necessary, to select one of these articles in order to find a solution.

The Norwegian representative, M. Colban, maintained his approval of the report. As regards Article 15, it was solely as a consequence of the explicit declaration of the Finnish

representative that this was not a case which could, in practice, lead to a rupture, that M. Colban had considered that it was difficult to admit of the application of that article, but he had in no way intended to express disagreement with the established theory of the League concerning its interpretation.

Lord Cecil thanked the Italian representative for his explanations, in view of which he stated that he would bring the report to the knowledge of his Government for consideration if the Council would adjourn the matter. The Finnish representative having agreed to this procedure, the Council pronounced the adjournment.

3. LITHUANIA AND POLAND.*

The advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice as to the extent to which it might be incumbent on Lithuania in the present circumstances to open the Landwarów-Kaisiadorys railway for traffic was noted by the Council on January 28th.*

On this occasion the Lithuanian representative, M. Zannius, recapitulated the more important stages of the Polish and Lithuanian question and, in conclusion, expressed the opinion that it would be impossible to bring about normal relations between the two countries until a solution "compatible with right and justice and accepted by the two parties concerned was found for the territorial dispute which still divided Lithuania and Poland."

The Polish representative said that, as he did not desire to follow the Lithuanian Government in transforming into a political debate a legal controversy settled by the Court, he would refrain from replying to the political statement made by the Lithuanian representative. On the other hand, he must point out that there was no compatibility between the Court's opinion and the Polish Government's point of view that the establishment of a normal situation in communications between Poland and Lithuania was essential to the aims of the Council resolutions of December 10th, 1927, and December 14th, 1928. Subject to these observations, he accepted the report.

4. GRECO-BULGARIAN INTER-MIGRATION.†

The report on the termination of the work

* The Court expressed the following opinion :

" The Court,
unanimously,
is of opinion

that the international engagements in force do not oblige Lithuania in the present circumstances to take the necessary steps to open for traffic or for certain categories of traffic the Landwarów-Kaisiadorys railway sector."

† Rapporteur : The French representative.

of the Mixed Commission was considered by the Council on January 28th.

The Mixed Commission, which terminated its work on January 31st, 1932, has now functioned for nearly twelve years. It was created on November 27th, 1919, when Bulgaria and Greece concluded a convention respecting the reciprocal voluntary emigration of racial minorities. The Mixed Commission set up under that Convention was composed of one member appointed by each of the contracting States and of an equal number of members of a different nationality nominated by the Council. Its duties were to supervise and facilitate voluntary emigration and to liquidate the real property of the emigrants.

The report submitted by the neutral members on the termination of the work shows that about 100,000 Bulgarians from Macedonia and Thrace and about 50,000 Greeks from Bulgaria have benefited under the Convention, and concludes in the following terms :

" It is true that international relations offered no precedent for this experiment, and that conditions were particularly difficult. However protracted and tentative it may have been, it does, we think, afford valuable guidance for the settlement of questions of this kind.

By its political and humanitarian results, the Convention of Neuilly will have contributed in large measure to the permanent removal of those disturbing factors which had for so long affected the Balkans.

It may prove to have yielded a more positive result—the effects of which will become evident in the near future—namely, the creation of closer and more intimate relations between the two neighbouring countries, which will constitute a guarantee of lasting peace between the States of the Peninsula."

The Chairman of the Mixed Commission, Colonel de Reynier, made a statement briefly summarising the work of the Commission, and expressed his gratitude to the representatives of the Greek and Bulgarian Governments and to all who had collaborated in the work.

The Bulgarian representative, M. Mikoff, thanked the Mixed Commission for the work it had accomplished. He felt bound, however, to draw attention to a financial question, namely, the delivery of the bonds referred to under the Moloff-Caphandaris Agreement, which had not so far been settled, but which he felt sure would be dealt with in the near future.

The Greek representative, M. Raphael, also thanked the neutral members of the Commission, the Council, and the Secretariat. The question raised by the Bulgarian representative was, he thought, solely within the competence of the Financial Committee,

The Norwegian representative, M. Colban, who had for many years personally followed the work of the Mixed Commission, expressed his gratitude to the Greek and Bulgarian Governments and to the Members of the Commission who, he said, had all contributed in the countries in which their work had been

carried out to increasing the prestige of the League.

The French representative, M. Paul-Boncour, speaking as President of the Council, congratulated the Bulgarian and Greek Governments, the Mixed Commissions, and, in particular, the neutral members, on the successful completion of the work.

IX.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

I. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

(a) *Limitation of Drug Manufacture.**

On January 28th the Council decided that the text of the Convention concluded by the Conference on the Limitation of Drug Manufacture, which met in the spring and summer of 1931, should be transmitted for purposes of accession to the following non-Member States, which were not represented at the Conference: Afghanistan, Ecuador, Iceland, Lichtenstein, and the Soudan.

Brazil, although represented at the Conference only by an observer, has already signed the Convention, and the Council approved the Secretary-General's action in accepting this signature.

(b) *Opium Smoking in the Far East.†*

The results of the Bangkok Conference on Opium Smoking in the Far East were considered by the Council on January 30th.‡

As regards certain recommendations of the Conference, for which the assistance of certain League organs was requested, the Council authorised the Opium Advisory Committee and the Health Committee to assist in preparing, and supervising the execution of, a programme of research into the physiological and psychological effects of opium and dross smoking, the constituents of opium which produce these effects, and their eventual replacement by some harmless substance, methods of cure of addiction to opium smoking, provision of a test for determining the character of dross.

The Council further requested the Opium Advisory Committee to prepare, for the use of Governments in whose territories the use of prepared opium is temporarily authorised, a form of annual report including particulars in regard to the measures taken to discourage the use of prepared opium, the cure and after-

cure of opium addicts, the classes of the population to which they belong, the average quantity consumed annually by smokers of each nationality, the consumption of opium per head of the population, and the current price of opium in the licit traffic.

In this connection the Chinese representative M. Yen, explained his Government's attitude with regard to the Bangkok Conference. Although invited to participate in the Conference, the Chinese Government had decided for the following reasons not to send a representative to Bangkok.§ The Conference had been convened under Article 12 of the 1925 Opium Agreement. According to the invitation received by the Chinese Government, the report of the Commission of Inquiry into Opium Smoking in the Far East was to constitute the most important basis of the discussion. China, however, was not a signatory of the Geneva Agreement; she had withdrawn from the Second Conference which led to that Agreement because she considered that it had not obtained satisfactory results as to measures to be taken with regard to the use of prepared opium. China had declared in 1925 that "no proposal that might be presented to the Conference would be acceptable to China which did not give definite assurance that within a reasonable period of time the termination of which could be clearly foreseen, the legalised traffic in prepared opium would be brought to an end."

Again, at the fifth meeting of the sixty-second session of the Council, the Chinese representative had made with regard to the report of the Commission of Inquiry into Opium Smoking in the Far East the most explicit reservations, which M. Yen did not propose to repeat.

Consequently, for the reasons mentioned, China did not participate in the Bangkok Conference, which had been only a limited Conference amongst a few of the signatories

* *Happertout*, the Yugoslav representative.

† See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XI, No. 12, page 337.

‡ The passage in Vol. XI, No. 12, page 337, concerning the Chinese Government's reasons for not participating in the Bangkok Conference is hereby cancelled.

of the 1912 Hague Convention ; she, therefore, remained as heretofore, bound only by the Hague Convention, of which she was a signatory, and not by the Agreements, Final Acts, Declarations or other decisions of the Bangkok Conference.

M. Yen wished further to state that his Government associated itself with the following declaration made by the American observer at the Bangkok Conference : " While prepared to lend all practicable aid to measures directed towards the suppression of the destructive vice the Government of the United States is not prepared to follow a line similar to or concurrent with that followed by other Governments so long as those other Governments elect to retain the monopoly system and are not willing to attempt prohibition."

As the Declaration issued by the Bangkok Conference and other documents in the report referred to China, M. Yen would ask the Council to agree that the memorandum which the Chinese Government proposed to send the Secretariat should be circulated at the same time as the report. Subject to these observations, M. Yen took note of the Yugoslav representative's report.

The rapporteur expressed the hope that it would be possible to circulate the Chinese memorandum at the same time as the documents of the Conference.

(c) *Meeting of the Permanent Central Opium Board.*

The Permanent Central Opium Board met at Geneva from January 18th to January 23rd, with Mr. Lyall (British) in the chair.

Mr. Lyall was re-elected Chairman, and M. Gallavresi Vice-Chairman. There were further present M. Lucide Agel (French), Mr. May (American), and Dr. Anselmino (German).

The agenda of this meeting included consideration of a table of discrepancies, and a comparative table of statistics for the third quarter of 1931 ; the progress report of the Secretary ; new tasks of the Board under the Convention for the Limitation of Drug Manufacture ; questions directly affecting the Board discussed at the Bangkok Conference for the Suppression of Opium Smoking in the Far East, and a memorandum by Dr. Anselmino on drug consumption.

* * *

Appointments.—The Council appointed M. Dragan Milicevic (Yugoslav) to succeed the

late Sir Basanta Mullick (India) on the Permanent Central Opium Board.

The new member of the Board was delegate to the Opium Conference of 1931, and assistant delegate to M. Fotitch on the Advisory Opium Committee in 1929, 1930, and 1931.

2. SLAVERY.*

The Committee of Experts on Slavery provided for by the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1931, was constituted by the Council on January 28th. The following members were appointed :

M. Angoulvant, Honorary Governor-General of the Colonies, former Governor of French West Africa, former Governor of French Equatorial Africa.

Mme. de Castro a Almeida, representative of Portugal to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, author of works on education and on humanitarian subjects.

M. Gohr, former Director-General at the Belgian Ministry for the Colonies and ex-Member of the Committee of Experts for Native Labour. Ex-Chairman of the Temporary Slavery Commission.

Lord Lugard, Member of the Permanent Mandates Commission, former Governor of Nigeria.

M. Neytzell de Wilde, ex-President of the Legislative Assembly of the Dutch Indies ; at present Chief of the Division for League of Nations and legal affairs at the Ministry for the Colonies, The Hague.

M. Lopez Olwan, formerly Director-General of Morocco and the Colonies.

Comm. Zedda, former Secretary-General to the Government of Erythrea (after having completed his career in the Italian Colonies).

The Director of the International Labour Office was invited to send an observer to follow the work of the Committee, which has been requested to meet at Geneva on April 4th, 1932. The Secretary-General will communicate to the experts certain material referred to by the Assembly resolution.†

The Council expressed its warm appreciation of a gift of 10,000 Swiss francs offered towards the expenses of the Committee by a client of the Friends' Provident and Century Life Office, London, which it decided to accept.

* Rapporteur : the British representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 9, page 273.

X.—OTHER QUESTIONS.

I. MEETING OF THE SUPERVISORY COMMISSION.

The Supervisory Commission met from January 22nd to January 24th at Geneva.

It examined various financial and administrative matters referred to it by the Assembly, and drew up a report for the Council on the question of the new League buildings.

The Commission (M. Stefan Osusky, M. J. Reveillaud, M. C. J. Hambro, Lord Meston of Agra, and M. G. de Ottlik) re-elected M. Stefan Osusky as its Chairman and Lord Meston as Vice-President. M. Reveillaud was elected rapporteur.

2. THE NEW LEAGUE BUILDINGS.*

In September, 1931, the Assembly, painfully surprised at the information furnished to the Fourth Committee by the Supervisory Commission, declared that it was "resolved in principle to keep within the estimate adopted last year," and instructed the Supervisory Commission to submit to the Council for approval as soon as possible a programme which would comply under the best possible conditions with the above decision.

After devoting four sessions to the examination of the question, seeking the advice of an eminent lawyer, discussing the matter with the architects and the Members of the Building Committee, arranging for an inquiry on certain points, the Supervisory Commission submitted to the Council a report proposing to complete the buildings under construction, that is, the Secretariat and the Library, but to postpone the erection of the Assembly Hall. In this connection, the Chairman of the Supervisory Commission, M. Osusky, explained that the Commission had succeeded in reducing the estimate to 23,107,000 francs, that is to say, a sum lower than that voted by the 1930 Assembly.

The Commission considered, moreover, that it would be wise to reckon 10 per cent. for unforeseen expenditure, and to provide a credit of 320,000 francs for the installation of telephone communications and other equipment for which no provision had been made in the 1930 estimate. The total estimate would thus be 25,577,000 francs.

M. Osusky added that the architects had spent 1,124,000 francs more on the foundations than had been estimated, and that the Commission had instituted an investigation. As

however it had not yet the necessary information, it could not express its opinion.

This was the situation when a serious difference of opinion arose between the members of the Commission. The majority (three votes to two) was in favour of suspending work on the Assembly Hall and eight committee rooms, in view of the financial situation of the world, of the Members of the League, and of the League itself. The minority, on the other hand, thought that the task of the Supervisory Commission was to prevent the estimate of 23,650,000 francs adopted in 1930 from being exceeded. In this connection, the Chairman pointed out that the Commission was unable to foresee the financial consequences of a suspension of the work. Compensation would have to be paid to the contractors as well as to the architects.

The Secretary-General announced that the Geneva authorities had written to draw his attention to the possible conclusions of a suspension of the work. They would be compelled, he said, to forego various important changes which they proposed, such as the lowering of the railway line, the making of various roads, etc. The whole contract which had been passed between the League and the Canton would have to be revised.

The Italian representative, M. Rosso, thought that the best and most economical conclusion would be to push the work forward as quickly as possible. The Assembly had recommended that work should be continued once the situation had been taken in hand. He considered it would be a waste of money to stop the work. The sums not expended would doubtless be exceeded by the losses involved in paying out certain sums due to the non-observance of the contracts. He urged that the work should be continued, and submitted a resolution to this effect.

Lord Cecil (British Empire) shared Mr. Rosso's opinion. From the economic point of view he thought there was no advantage in limiting the work.

M. Colban (Norway) asked whether the Supervisory Commission could not reconsider the question.

M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia) associated himself with M. Rosso's opinion.

The German representative, M. von Weizsäcker, thought that the Council had need of mature reflection before taking its decision.

* Rapporteur: the representative of Guatemala.

The Secretary-General expressed the view that the majority of the Supervisory Commission was suggesting an action which went beyond the Assembly's decision. In his opinion, it would be very dangerous to take any step unless the Council was unanimous as to its necessity.

The Spanish representative, M. de Zulueta, thought that the suspension of work might involve expense which would perhaps be as much as that which it was desired to avoid.

M. Zaleski (Poland) and M. Matos (Guatemala) also shared the view of the Italian representative.

The German representative regretted that he could not adhere to this view.

The President noted that there was no Council majority in favour of suspending the work.

3. SESSION OF THE LEAGUE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL.

The Administrative Tribunal of the League of Nations sat from January 11th to January 13th, under the presidency of M. Albert Devèze, Belgian Minister of State, considering various questions concerning the Staff Regulations of the League Secretariat.

M. Devèze, the retiring President, who is not re-eligible, appointed M. Montagna (Italy) as President, and M. Froehlich (Germany) as Vice-President.

4. QUESTION OF THE RESIGNATION OF SIR ERIC DRUMMOND.

The President of the Council received from the Secretary-General the following letter :

Sir,

I have the honour to submit to the Council my resignation of the post of Secretary-General of the League of Nations, to which I am appointed by the Annex to the Covenant, and which I have already held for nearly twelve years.

It has for some considerable time past been my intention to resign this post ; but I did not think it right to do so while certain questions relating to the organisation of the Secretariat were under consideration by the Assembly, and in view of the meeting of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

I should be glad if my resignation could take effect as from a convenient date during the first six months of 1933.

Having regard to Article 6 of the Covenant, I request that this letter may be circulated to the members of the League.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,
(Sd.) ERIC DRUMMOND,
Secretary-General.

The Council considered this communication and unanimously pressed Sir Eric Drummond to revoke his decision. As the Secretary-General did not feel able to comply with this request, the Council felt bound to communicate the letter to all States Members, reserving, however, its decision for a later session.

XI.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

February 9th—March 3rd.—Committee of Experts on Customs Nomenclature, Geneva.

March 10th.—Special Committee for the Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube and Delegates of the Committee for European Union, Geneva.

March 15th.—Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, Geneva.

March 30th.—Directors' Committee and Executive Committee of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, Paris.

April 4th.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

April 4th.—Traffic in Women and Children Committee, Geneva.

April 9th.—Child Welfare Committee, Geneva.

April 9th.—Financial Committee, Geneva.

April 9th.—Gold Delegation of the Financial Committee, Geneva.

May 12th.—Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, Frankfort-on-Main.

June 6th.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.
JUST OUT.

EIGHTH YEAR. SPECIAL EDITION.

GENERAL AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

474 pages Price : in wrappers 7s. 6d. \$2.—
bound in cloth 10s. \$3.—

This special edition will be a source of information, not only for delegates to the Conference, but also for all others who are anxious to follow closely the work of the Conference.

163 pages **Price 2s. \$0.50.**

This work has been prepared by the Political and Legal Reference Service of the League of Nations Library to supply information on the principal publications which have appeared in connection with disarmament and on a selection of works dealing with military questions. Brief summaries are given of the contents of the works mentioned.

(February, 1932)

127 pages **Price: 1s. \$0.25.**

The Information Section of the League of Nations Secretariat has just issued this pamphlet containing a brief introduction, a summary of the obligations and assurances of the States of the world regarding armaments, a survey of the way in which the problem has been approached, an analysis of the Draft Convention presented to the Governments by the Preparatory Commission, the action of the Council and the Assembly of the League in 1931, including the text of the Draft Convention, a summary of the Washington and London Naval Treaties, etc.

Complete Catalogue sent free of charge on application.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly).

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 5s. \$1.25

4. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual):

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (*Trilingual*) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (*Trilingual*) (Annual):

Price: 1s. \$0.25

9. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

Vocational Guidance in Agriculture.	vii + 244 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
Colour Vision Tests.	47 pp.	2s.	\$0.50
*Unemployment and Public Works.	186 pp.	4s.	\$1.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations.	xii + 263 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s.	\$1.25
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky.	v + 212 pp.		4s.	\$1.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August 1930.	iv + 692 pp.	16s.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931.	iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s.	\$1.50
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler.	v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
		{ Cloth bound	4s.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building.	xii + 378 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation.	vii + 381 pp.	8s.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene.	vii. + 188 pp.	6s.	\$1.50

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)	£3	3s. od.	\$16.00
Volume edition (in two volumes)	{ Paper bound	£3	3s. od.	\$16.00
	{ Cloth bound	£3	10s. od.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of 'any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN	U.S.A.	JAPAN	INDIA
Mr. M. R. K. BURGE, 12, Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1. (Telegrams: Interlab, Sowest, London.) Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)	American Sales Agents: WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION, 40, Mount Vernon Street, Boston 9, Mass.	Mr. J. ASARI, Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya Park, Kojimachiku, Tokio. (Telegrams: Kokusairodo, Tokio. Telephone: Ginza 1580.)	Mr. P. P. PILLAI, International Labour Office (Indian Branch) New Delhi. (Telegrams: Interlab, New Delhi.)

LEAGUE OF NATIONS PAMPHLETS

(Prepared by the Information Section)

JUST PUBLISHED

DISARMAMENT

PREPARATIONS for the GENERAL CONFERENCE
(February, 1932)

The Information Section of the League of Nations Secretariat has just issued a pamphlet describing the preparations for the First General Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments, which opens at Geneva on February 2nd, 1932.

The pamphlet contains a brief introduction, a summary of the obligations and assurances of the States of the world regarding armaments, a survey of the way in which the problem has been approached, an analysis of the Draft Convention presented to the Governments by the Preparatory Commission, the action of the Council and the Assembly of the League in 1931, including the adoption of an Armaments Truce, and Annexes, including the text of the Draft Convention, a summary of the Washington and London Naval Treaties, etc.

The purpose of the pamphlet is to give a plain and objective account of the problems with which the Conference will be confronted. It is in no sense a partisan publication; it adopts no points of view, but attempts simply to explain the proposals which will be before the Conference and the attitude of the different Governments towards them.

With this pamphlet it should be possible to have accurate and impartial knowledge, not only of the subjects before the Conference, but also of the difficulties and controversies with which the Conference will have to deal.

The Price of the Pamphlet is
1/- or 25 cents.

Orders should be addressed to the Agents of the League of Nations Publications or to the Publications Department, League of Nations, Geneva.

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1932

Conference for the Reduction
and Limitation of
Armaments.

Appeal of the Chinese
Government.

League Organisations and
Commissions.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
WELLINGTON STREET
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, February, 1932</i>	35	VI. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments . . .</i>	35	1. Appeal of the Chinese Govern-ment	41
III. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		2. Memel	52
The Economic and Financial Organisation :		3. Liberia	53
(a) Customs Nomenclature	39	VII. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	55
(b) The Hop Production and Trade	39		
IV. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>		<i>The Permanent Court of International Justice.</i>	
Meeting of Experts for the Revision of School Books	40	1. Sessions of the Court	56
V. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>		2. Treatment of Polish Nationals at Danzig	56
1. Danzig	40	3. The Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement	58
2. The Saar	40		
3. Mandates :		<i>Annex I.—Organisations and Commissions of the League of Nations</i>	59
(a) Iraq	41	<i>Annex II.—The Permanent Court of International Justice</i>	78
(b) Frontier between Syria and Iraq	41		

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

February, 1932.

The principal League events of February were the opening of the First Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, and the convocation of the Assembly at the request of the Chinese Government.

The Council, which opened on January 25th, continued in session during February to consider the appeal of the Chinese Government under Articles 10, 11, and 15 of the Covenant.

Other meetings were those of a Committee

of experts on hop production and trade, and of a Committee preparing a unified customs nomenclature.

The Permanent Court of International Justice gave its advisory opinion on questions referred to it by the Council concerning the treatment of Polish nationals and other persons of Polish origin or language in the territory of the Free City of Danzig.

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The General Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments opened on February 2nd, under the Presidency of Mr. Arthur Henderson. Mr. Motta (Switzerland) was elected honorary President.

Delegations were sent by fifty-nine States, namely: Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentine, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia,

Brazil, British Empire, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa-Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Hungary, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland,

Portugal, Roumania, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia. The Dominican Republic sent observers.

In his opening speech the President, Mr. Arthur Henderson, emphasised the unique importance of the Conference, and defined its task as follows:

- (a) to arrive at a collective agreement on an effective programme of practical proposals speedily to secure a substantial reduction and limitation of all national armaments;
- (b) to determine that no armaments should be maintained outside the scope of the treaty by which all nations represented at the Conference would make the achievement of universal disarmament their common aim; and
- (c) to ensure continuity of advance in disarmament, without detracting in any way from the fullest measure of success of the minimum effort of the Conference, by arranging for similar conferences to meet at reasonably short intervals of time.

There was, he said, no graver or more certain menace to peace and security than the maintenance of formidable armaments, and public opinion was expecting a definite advance to be made towards their reduction. The League had worked continuously since its foundation for the organisation of peace, and the Members of the League, under Article 8 of the Covenant, had from the outset recognised that the maintenance of peace required the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

He then briefly recapitulated the past stages of the work (the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance in 1923, the Geneva Protocol of 1924, the appointment of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference following the Locarno Agreements of 1925, the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes in 1928, the Convention on Financial Assistance of 1930—and finally, most important of all, outside the League, but directed towards the same end—the Paris Pact for the Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy and the Washington and London Naval Agreements).

Parallel to these later developments, the Preparatory Commission had embodied the results of its technical work in a draft Convention for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments completed in December, 1930. This Convention represented five years of preparation and discussion. It was intended to provide a framework by means of which the

limitation and reduction of armaments might be achieved. It prescribed methods, but did not contain any figures, and it would be for the present Conference to determine its practical scope, since in the Preparatory Commission there had not been agreement as to the text; even as regards methods opinions had differed. The Conference would be free to consider any other proposals submitted. The Convention might be conveniently regarded as a synopsis of the problems before the Conference.

Mr. Henderson concluded in the following terms:

"The problem of disarmament is vitally relevant to the grave economic and financial crisis for which most nations are at the moment trying to find a solution. The financial burden of armaments and of past wars, indeed, is one of its main contributory causes. It is one of the principal causes of unbalanced budgets in a large number of countries. . . .

World opinion demands that every effort be made at this Conference to achieve a substantial reduction of this prodigious expenditure. This is not merely because such expenditure is entirely unproductive, but also because even the maintenance of armaments on their present level constitutes a menace to the peace of the world. . . .

"The world wants disarmament. The world needs disarmament. We have it in our power to help fashion the pattern of future history. Behind all the technical complexities regarding man-power, gun-power, tonnage, categories, and the like, is the well-being of mankind, the future of our developing civilisation. Mankind is looking to this Conference, with its unrivalled experience and knowledge, its unchallengeable representative authority and power, its massed wisdom and capacity, to bestow the gift of freedom from the menace to peace and security that the maintenance of huge national armaments must ever be. If we succeed, we shall have made, I confidently predict, a decisive contribution to strengthening the bulwarks we have been patiently building against war.

"I refuse to contemplate even the possibility of failure. . . ."

The Conference immediately constituted three Committees: a Credentials Committee, a Committee for the Examination of Petitions, and a Committee on Procedure.

The first two, with their respective Presidents, M. Aguero y Bethancourt (Cuba), and M. Reynaud (France), submitted their reports on February 4th.

The Committee on Petitions was called upon to examine the petitions already received and the conditions under which they could be presented at an extraordinary meeting of the Conference, organised at the suggestion of the President. This meeting was held on February 6th, the organisations heard being grouped as follows:

- (a) Women's Organisations.
- (b) Religious Organisations.
- (c) Students' Organisations.
- (d) International League for the Rights of Man and Citizenship.
- (e) Workers' Organisations.
- (f) International Federation of League of Nations Societies.

On the proposal of the Committee on Procedure, the Conference, on February 4th, decided that its Bureau should consist of the President, the Honorary President, the Vice-President, and the Chairmen of the Commissions, on which all delegations are represented.

The Committee on Procedure suggested the immediate constitution of a General Commission, and the creation later on of four other Commissions, on military, naval, air, and questions of national defence expenditure.

On February 5th the Conference elected its Bureau. The fourteen Vice-Presidents elected were the French, Italian, British, American, German, Swedish, Japanese, Spanish, Argentine, Belgian, Soviet, Czechoslovak, Polish, and Austrian representatives.

The general discussion opened on February 8th and closed on February 24th, bringing to the platform the fifty following speakers: Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), M. Tardieu (France), Mr. Gibson (United States), M. Brüning (Germany), M. Macedo Soares (Brazil), M. Grandi (Italy), M. Matsudeira (Japan), M. Zaleski (Poland), M. Hymans (Belgium), M. Litvinoff (U.S.S.R.), Baron Ramel (Sweden), M. de Zulueta (Spain), M. Munch (Denmark), M. Benes (Czechoslovakia), Sir George Perley (Canada), M. Zarine (Latvia), Count Apponyi (Hungary), M. Yen (China), Tevfik Rustu Bey (Turkey), M. Colban (Norway), M. Brando (Portugal), M. Beelaerts van Blokland (Netherlands), M. Bosch (Argentine Republic), Mirza Hussein Khan Ala (Persia), M. Motta (Switzerland), M. Marinkovitch (Yugoslavia), Sir Thomas Wilford (New Zealand), Baron Yrjö-Koskinen (Finland), M. Ghika (Roumania), M. Pflügl (Austria), General Laidoner (Estonia), M. Pedro Cosío (Uruguay), M. Nadolny (Germany), M. Malinoff (Bulgaria), Sir Granville de Laune Ryrie (Australia), M. Mayard (Haiti), Mahmoud Fakhry Pacha (Egypt), the Aga Khan (India), M. Castillo Najera (Mexico), M. Te Water (Union of South Africa), M. Valdés Mendeveille (Chile), M. Zaunius (Lithuania), M. Matos (Guatemala), M. Escalante (Venezuela), M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), M. Restrepo (Colombia), Hussein Aziz (Afghanistan), M. Lec Kurti (Albania), M. Michalakopoulos (Greece), M. Garay (Panama).

In the course of the debate, the representatives of the various States did not merely set forth their point of view in general terms;

nearly all formulated practical suggestions or deposited definite and detailed proposals.

At the end of the general discussion, the President expressed the view that the discussion had revealed the existence, on the one hand, of a common desire to secure the greatest possible measure of success, as well as wide agreement on certain fundamental principles. It had, however, revealed that a great variety of methods were favourably regarded by the various delegations. No single speaker had been content with the measure of armament reduction which his own nation might have been able independently to carry through, and it had been generally recognised that the reduction of armaments had a direct and indirect bearing on the present political and economic crisis.

Mr. Henderson continued:

"The value of the preparatory work done by the Preparatory Commission and other organs of the League has also been fully recognised.

"No fundamental objection has been raised against utilising the Draft Convention, however deficient it may seem to certain delegations, as a framework for the discussions of the Conference.

"Already at the present stage, a series of important proposals have been made with a view to improving the Convention and enlarging its scope.

"This applies to the chapters on land, naval and air armaments, as well as on chemical warfare, and on the general provisions of the Draft Convention.

"The principle of an effective limitation of national armaments and the establishment of an efficient supervision may be regarded as definitely accepted.

"As regards the amount of reduction to be aimed at, it is perhaps too early yet to try to express any general tendency in the Conference.

"The necessity of prohibiting or in any case limiting or regulating the use of certain arms which are deemed particularly offensive in character, has been generally accepted.

"It has been recognised that modern armament development has given to weapons of attack a definite predominance over weapons of defence.

"That predominance not only accounts for the greater destructiveness of any future war, but has a deep political significance because it makes easier successful aggression which it is the purpose of the Covenant and the Pact of Paris to prevent.

"It has, therefore, I think, been unanimously agreed as one of our guiding principles, that the community of nations should take effective steps to deal with the problem so created, and that means must be found to reduce the dangers which the so-called weapons of aggression now create.

"To this end most important proposals have been made both as regards land armaments (tanks and big guns), naval armaments (capital ships, aircraft-carriers and submarines), and air armaments.

"Particular attention has been paid to the last category, which includes the newest and

perhaps the most blindly destructive weapons. We have had proposals for the internationalisation of civil aviation, for the abolition of military aviation (as a whole or in part) and for the placing of an Air Force at the disposal of the League of Nations. This problem will no doubt, both from a political and from a technical point of view, be one of the most important which the Conference has to solve.

"Chemical and bacteriological warfare have met with universal condemnation, and proposals have been put forward according to which not only their use in wartime but their preparation in peace-time should be effectively prohibited.

"On these points I think it can be said that the opinion has prevailed that this suppression must not be on paper only. It would indeed be a tragic thing if, having given up the right of war by the Pact of Paris, this Conference should now settle down to make the rules by which future war should be conducted."

The General Commission met on February 24th and appointed Dr. Benes (Czechoslovak) as rapporteur. It considered the method to be adopted in studying the proposals referred to it by the Conference. Two draft resolutions were deposited, one by Sir John Simon, the other by M. Litvinoff. The text recommended by Sir John Simon read as follows:

"The General Commission resolves to carry on its discussions within the framework of the Draft Disarmament Convention, full liberty being reserved to all delegations to develop their own proposals in subsequent debate and to move their amendments in the form of modifications, additions or omissions at the appropriate point;"

That recommended by M. Litvinoff:

"Animated by the firm desire for an effective and solidly organised peace;

Actuated by the determination to create genuine security for all States and all peoples by preventing the possibility of future wars;

"Convinced that the very existence of armaments and the tendency they show constantly to increase inevitably lead to armed international conflicts which tear the workers from their peaceful occupations and bring innumerable calamities in their train;

"Considering that military expenditure, which imposes an intolerable burden upon the masses of the people, fosters and enhances the economic crisis with all its consequences;

"Noting that the States which it represents have renounced war as an instrument of national policy;

"Believing that the only effective means of contributing to the organisation of peace and the establishment of security against war is the general, complete and rapid abolition of all armed forces, setting out from the principle of equality for all;

"Convinced that the idea of general and complete disarmament answers to the sincere aspiration of the masses towards peace;

"The Conference decides to base its work on the principle of general and complete disarmament."

On February 25th, after a statement by M. Litvinoff and speeches by the Turkish, Persian,

German, Uruguayan, and Spanish representatives, and by the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, M. Litvinoff's proposal was rejected by a large majority, only three delegations, Persia, Turkey, and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics voting for it.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) then proposed to insert as a preamble to Sir John Simon's text most of the considerations embodied in M. Litvinoff's proposal. Sir John Simon agreed, but, after an exchange of views between the German, Turkish, and Soviet representatives, M. de Madariaga and Sir John Simon, the Commission unanimously adopted Sir John Simon's original text.

On the same day, the General Commission considered the question of the creation of commissions.

M. Tardieu (France) recalled that, up to the present, the constitution of four Commissions in addition to the General Commission had been contemplated. These Commissions would be called upon to deal with military, naval, air, and budget questions. The French representative suggested that as the Commission had decided to take as its framework the 1930 draft Convention, it might be more logical to adopt the divisions contemplated in the draft Convention, namely, effectives, material, expenditure. He would, however, refrain from pressing this point, but proposed the creation of a political commission to study suggestions relating to the organisation of peace and control.*

After statements by the British, Turkish, German, Roumanian, Netherlands, Italian, American, Yugoslav, and Spanish representatives, and by the Chairman and the Secretary-General, the Commission unanimously decided to constitute five Commissions, on which all delegations would be represented: the Military, Naval, Air, National Defence Expenditure, and Political Commissions.

On February 27th, these Commissions met for the first time, appointing as follows their principal officers:

Political Commission.—Chairman: Mr. Henderson; Vice-Chairman: M. Politis (Greece); Rapporteur: Dr. Benes.

Military Commission.—Chairman: M. Buero (Uruguay).

Naval Commission.—Chairman: M. Colban (Norway).

Air Commission.—Chairman: M. de Madariaga (Spain).

Commission on National Defence Expenditure.—Chairman: M. de Vasconcellos (Portugal).

* All the proposals and suggestions submitted to the Conference in February have been published in a single document (Document Conf. D. 99). See advertisement.

III.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Customs Nomenclature.*

At its session held from February 9th to February 27th, the Sub-Committee on Customs Nomenclature revised its commentary on the following sections of its framework: Live animals and animal products; vegetable products; fatty substances, grease, oil, etc.; products of the food industry; mineral products; chemical and pharmaceutical products; hides, leathers, skins, etc.; articles made of these wares; wood, cork, and articles made therefrom, etc.

The Sub-Committee has still to revise its commentary on thirteen sections. This it hopes to do at its next session, which will be held in April. As soon as this work is completed, the draft customs nomenclature, together with the commentary, will be forwarded to Governments and published.

(b) *The Hop Production and Trade.*

The experts whom the Economic Committee decided to convene at its January session met at Geneva on February 22nd, 23rd, and 24th, to consider the situation as regards the hop production and trade, and to study the international remedies that might be applied. The following experts were present:—

Germany.

Dr. Düring, Minister for Food and Agriculture.

Belgium.

M. Simoens, State Agriculturist.

France.

M. Urban, President of the Alsatian Syndicate of Hop Growers.

M. René Henry Weill, President of the Syndical Chamber of the French Hop Trade, Adviser on Foreign Trade.

Poland.

M. Kleniewski, President of the Polish Hop Growers' Syndicate.

Czechoslovakia.

M. Vrbensky, Assistant Professor at the Higher Agricultural College, Prague.

Yugoslavia.

M. Mayer, Secretary of the Vojvodinaer Hopfenbauverband.

There were also present:

Dr. O. Hartig, President of the Central European Hop Bureau; and

M. von Koch, President of the German Hop Growers' Syndicate.

A British expert had been invited, but the British circles concerned expressed the opinion that, as British hops did not play an important

part in the international trade, the presence of a British expert was not necessary.

The experts proceeded to a thorough examination which revealed the gravity of the crisis from which the hop trade is suffering. The crops are sold at prices which represent only a fraction of the cost of producing. The greater part of the hops has been left on the spot. The average prices only amount to rs. 10d. of the 1926 prices, and are less by more than 2s. 3d. than the average prices for 1930.

The experts were unanimously of the opinion that an endeavour should be made to adapt production to consumption. Of their own accord the producers have already uprooted a considerable part of the hop gardens despite the amount of capital invested; but there are still large stocks on the market. In certain countries there has been a considerable reduction. The experts recommend that, in countries where production is largely in excess of consumption, restrictive action should be promoted by judicious propaganda directed by professionals.

But on the other hand the experts unanimously emphasised that, to remedy the crisis, there must be an end of chaotic production. The producing countries must be able to follow the development of the hop cultivation and to organise it. It must no longer be allowed to develop along its own lines in each country regardless of conditions on the world market.

The experts considered that it would be to the advantage of producers in all countries to unite their efforts to combat the crisis. The meeting showed the urgent necessity of co-operation between producing countries. The relations between producers should be maintained and tightened up. An international hop centre would facilitate relations by studying with the International Institute of Agriculture all the problems raised in connection with the hop production and trade. An organisation which already exists, the Central European Hop Bureau, might serve as a basis for the constitution of the proposed international organisation. This neutral organisation, which affords every guarantee of impartiality, would study the remedial measures proposed by experts, in particular how to dispose of the stocks.

The meeting showed that there was agreement between the experts on essential questions, but the consequences of accumulated over-production cannot be immediately removed. During the present year, it must be expected that the hop trade will encounter very serious difficulties.

IV.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

REVISION OF SCHOOL BOOKS.

A Committee of experts met in February at the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation to consider the possibility of deleting from school books passages detrimental to the good understanding between peoples.

The experts present were : M. Glotz, Member of the Institute, Professor at Paris University, Chairman ; M. Bjerke, Vice-President of the Swedish Association of Primary School Masters ; M. Brandt, Professor at Erlangen University ; M. Casares, Member of the Spanish Academy ; M. Piaget, Director of the International Education Office ; Mlle. Power, Professor at London

University ; and M. Vignola, Senior Inspector at the Italian Board of Secondary Education.

Basing its discussion on a printed report of the Institute describing the steps already taken in the various countries and the proposals formulated by Organisations, the Committee recommended the improvement of the existing international procedure embodied in the so-called "Casares resolution" ; the continuation, with the assent of Governments, of the inquiry undertaken by the Institute, and suggestions to authorities dealing with the question of school books in the various countries.

V.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

1. DANZIG.

The advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice on legal points concerning the treatment of Polish nationals and other persons of Polish origin or speech at Danzig* came before the Council on February 6th. The Council instructed the Secretary-General to communicate the text of the opinion to the League High Commissioner at Danzig.

2. FORTY-EIGHTH REPORT OF THE SAAR GOVERNING COMMISSION.

The forty-eighth report of the Saar Governing Commission, which was received by the Secretary-General in February, describes the economic, social, political, and administrative situation in the Saar territory during October, November, and December, 1931.

Economic and Social Situation.—The report gives numerical data concerning coal, coke, cast-iron and steel production, and cost of living.

The number of unemployed rose from 20,025 in August to 28,659 in November.

Administration. Police.—Certain extreme parties having for some time past organised manœuvres and night marches, the Governing Commission, with a view to the maintenance of order and public safety, promulgated on December 16th, a provisional decree prohibiting the execution and preparation out-of-doors from 5 in the evening to 7 in the morning of all collective exercises ; field manœuvres, marching in columns. It also promulgated, on December 14th, 1931, two decrees, the first making the declaration of arms obligatory, and the second prohibiting the unlawful use of arms.

Finance.—The constant increase in the relief expenditure of the communes and the decrease of revenue from taxation caused the Governing Commission to submit to the Advisory Council a draft decree obliging the communes to balance their revenue and expenditure by the strictest economy.

The Advisory Council had, further, to consider a draft decree according to which the communes and *Gemeindeverbände* will henceforth no longer be able to contract short term loans, furnish security, or enter into other obligations of this kind without a preliminary authorisation from the competent authority. The Governing Commission reserves its right to supervise these operations and, if necessary, to intervene.

To enable the savings banks and, if necessary, communes to invest their available funds in the territory, the Governing Commission submitted to the Advisory Council a draft decree for the creation of a central deposit bank under the supervision and direction of the Finance Department. According to the Decree, all available funds must be deposited with this bank.

By these measures the Commission hopes to support the finances of the communes during the crisis, prevent the communes running the risk of falling into debt, and guarantee the resources of the public savings bank.

Economic Questions.—The Commission watched attentively the effect upon the Saar of measures recently promulgated in France concerning the rationing or authorisation of the importation of various wares into the customs territory. As regards cereals, it deputed the Saarbruck Derogation Commission to ensure the relations between the interested parties and the competent French authority. Negotiations are in progress on various other points.

* See Chapter on the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Railways.—The economic crisis resulted in a considerable decrease since 1930 of railway revenue as a whole and, more particularly, that from goods transport. In 1929 this revenue amounted to Frs. 352,000,000, in 1930 it fell to 319,000,000, and in 1931 to 2,090,000. The expenditure did not decrease in a similar proportion. To cope with the situation, the Commission adopted measures to increase passenger and goods traffic to the greatest possible extent by means of reductions in railway rates and the improvement of the service and, at the same time, endeavoured to reduce running expenses (reduction of staff, reduction of salaries, rationalisation of services, upkeep of material).

These measures are intended to adapt the railway service to the situation resulting from the crisis and, further, to improve technical methods, and thus to realise permanent progress.

The budget for 1931-1932 showed a deficit of 55,000,000, whilst the draft budget for 1932-1933 shows a deficit of 35,000,000. The situation was, none the less, serious, and will be carefully watched.

3. MANDATES.

(a) *Iraq.*

Subsequent to the Council resolution of January 28th, the Special Committee appointed to examine the guarantees to be given by Iraq in view of the termination of the mandate régime, met at Geneva from January 28th to February 10th. This Committee was composed of the Council rapporteurs on minority questions, international law and mandates, and the British representative on the Council. The Prime Minister of Iraq and a representative of the Mandates Commission co-operated in an advisory capacity.

The Committee began its study of a draft declaration to be made by Iraq to the Council, which concerns the protection of minorities, judicial organisation, and the other economic and financial points mentioned in the conclusions of the Mandates Commission and during the Council discussion. It will meet later to draw

up its report, which will be submitted at the next session of the Council.

* * * *

The King of Iraq and the President of the Iraq Chamber of Deputies have addressed to the President of the Council the following telegrams, dated January 31st:

"I am deeply moved and thankful to Your Excellency and members of the Council for the happy resolution adopted with regard to my Kingdom your resolutions proved solemn realisation of high ideals which League have set to enable nations enjoy their liberty and independence my people gratefully appreciating Council's resolution count it great encouragement for progress and our entry into League shall add to realisation of high ideals League endeavouring to achieve in world peace.—FAISAL."

"The Iraq Chamber of Deputies have asked me to express to your Excellency and to the Council their great thanks for the preliminary decision you have taken regarding the admission of Iraq to the League of Nations.—JAMIL ALMADFAAI, President Iraq Chamber of Deputies."

(b) *Frontier between Syria and Iraq.**

On December 9th the Council requested the Spanish representative and the Yugoslav representative, rapporteur on mandates questions, to appoint the members of the Commission for examining on the spot the question of the frontier between Syria and Iraq.

This Commission has been constituted as follows, after consulting the Mandatory Powers concerned:

President.—Colonel de Reynier (Swiss); former President of the Danzig Port and Waterways Board, former Records Commissioner of the Saar, former President of the Greco-Bulgarian Mixed Emigration Commission.

Members.—M. Pedro Marades Gomez (Spanish); First-class commercial attaché at the Spanish Embassy in Berlin, former Consul at Damascus, Jerusalem, Beyrouth, and Cette. M. Carl Petersen (Swedish), Director of Section at the Secretariat of the International League of Red Cross Societies.

VI.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

On January 29th the Chinese representative requested that the Council, while continuing to examine the Sino-Japanese dispute under Article 11, should also consider it under Articles 10 and 15 of the Covenant.

On January 30th, in accordance with the first paragraph of Article 15, the Secretary-General asked certain Governments, Members of the

Council, having official representatives at Shanghai, to invite these officials to form a commission which would be instructed to report to the Council on the Shanghai incidents, their causes and their development. All these Governments (Germany, the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Italy, and Norway) gave a favourable answer.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 12, page 332.

On February 1st the United States Government, whom the Secretary-General had asked if it would be possible for it to co-operate with the Members of the Council, intimated that, while it did not feel able to appoint a delegate as member of the commission, it would willingly agree to instruct one of its representatives to co-operate with it.

On the same date, the Chinese Government sent a telegram to the Secretary-General stating that, contrary to rumour, it did not intend to declare war on Japan. It would confine itself to exercising the right of legitimate defence inherent in the sovereignty of the Chinese State. On the same day, the Japanese representative on the Council communicated to the Secretary-General an official telegram from Tokio concerning the interview which the Japanese Foreign Minister had had on January 31st with the British, American, and French Ambassadors, when he had explained the origin and the development of the Shanghai incidents. From these explanations, the Japanese representative considered that it was clear that the action which the Japanese forces had been obliged to take at Shanghai had been the result of an aggression on the part of the Chinese, followed by repeated violations of the agreements concluded at the intervention of representatives of third parties.

At the request of the British Government the Council met on February 2nd. The British representative, Mr. J. H. Thomas, said that his Government felt that it was impossible that the present position should be allowed to continue in the Far East where, over a wide area round Shanghai, war in everything but name was in progress.

Mr. Thomas added :

"To such a state of things the Members of the League of Nations cannot be indifferent. If it is allowed to go on, the Covenant, the Pact of Paris, and the Nine-Power Treaty, must inevitably lose the confidence of the world.

"It is not without significance to Members of the League that the United States Government take entirely the same view of the situation. In all the efforts for peace put forth by the Council during the last four months we have been happy to receive the whole-hearted sympathy and support of the United States. On several recent occasions the Council have pressed its members to second its efforts by diplomatic representations to the two Governments concerned. His Majesty's Government and other Governments Members of the League have shown themselves ready to respond to that appeal. Unfortunately, these efforts have been so far unsuccessful. His Majesty's Government therefore, in concert with the Government of the United States, have decided to make a further effort to bring the present lamentable state of things to an end, and

they trust that other Governments will see their way to take similar action. They have accordingly presented at Tokio and Nanking a formal request :

(1) That all acts of violence and preparations for hostilities shall be brought to an end ;

(2) That in the Shanghai area both sides shall withdraw their troops, and that as a further protection to the International Settlement a neutral zone shall be arranged ;

(3) That negotiations shall then be immediately begun to settle outstanding differences in the spirit of the Pact of Paris and the Council resolution of the 9th December last."

Mr. Thomas then read a statement by the British Government made the same afternoon in the House of Commons and expressed the hope that the measures taken by his Government would be approved and supported by all Members of the Council.

The President, M. André Tardieu, replacing M. Paul-Boncour, absent from Geneva, said that the French Government had instructed its representatives at Tokio and Nanking to support the steps taken by the United States and Great Britain.

M. Grandi (Italy) made a similar communication. M. von Weisäcker (Germany) said that he would not fail to inform his Government of the statement made to the Council, so that it would be able to give immediate and adequate instructions to its representatives in the two capitals in question.

M. Yen (China) said that his country was deeply appreciative of the steps taken by the Powers.

M. Sato (Japan) expressed his satisfaction at these statements, recalling that his Government had asked the British, French, and American representatives to take concerted action at Shanghai. He drew attention to the fact that the idea of a neutral zone between the two armed forces had first been advanced by the Japanese representative at Shanghai at a meeting with the commanders of the forces stationed at Shanghai and the Consuls-General.

The President pointed out that, as far as local events were concerned, the Council would be obliged to await the report of the Commission constituted at Shanghai. By communicating its proposal to the Council, the British Government and the Governments which had supported it had desired to associate the Council's authority with the steps taken by the different countries for a pacific settlement of the question. The President noted that this object had been achieved.

On February 6th the Commission constituted at Shanghai, under the presidency of M. Ciano, Consul-General of Italy, transmitted its first

report on the events which had taken place at Shanghai and in the vicinity up to January 31st.* The Director of the Transit Section, M. Haas, then at Shanghai, acted as secretary of the Commission.

On February 7th the Chinese representative expressed the opinion that the arrival of the report rendered necessary the immediate convocation of the Council, in view of the gravity of the events which were taking place at Shanghai, where, he said, thousands of men, women, and children had been killed and wounded by air bombardment and Japanese cannon.

On the same day M. Sato transmitted a declaration published at Tokio concerning the despatch of troops to Shanghai. This declaration stated that the Japanese Government merely intended to maintain, by every means in its power, order in the Far East, and to contribute to the pacific progress of the world. The political instability which existed in China and the anti-foreign and, more particularly, the anti-Japanese agitation had caused serious concern to all Powers and, above all, to Japan, who was China's neighbour. The incidents which had taken place at Shanghai had originated in contempt for Japan and in acts of physical violence. As the Chinese authorities had not succeeded in controlling the situation, Japan had been obliged to send reinforcements to assist the detachment of marine rifles which had first landed. The expeditionary force had been limited to the strictly necessary effectives and would undertake no offensive action, provided the Chinese did not attempt to prevent the Japanese forces from attaining their goal.

This statement further indicated that the Japanese Government had no political ambitions in the region of Shanghai, nor any idea of infringing the rights and interests of any other Power.

On February 9th the Council resumed its examination of the position.

M. Yen (China), recalling M. Tardieu's communication, declared that Japan was continuing her warlike preparations. Her troops were proceeding in steadily increasing numbers to the Shanghai area, and her operations in Manchuria had now included the important city of Harbin. Seventy-five thousand Japanese soldiers were in Manchuria, and twenty-five thousand in the Shanghai area. He denied that the landing of Japanese troops at Shanghai and their invasion of Chinese territory were the outcome of previous arrangements with the

commanders of the other foreign contingents of Shanghai. The present state of affairs was intolerable, not only for China, but also for the League and the Powers. The very essence of the formula presented by the Powers to Japan had been rejected. In conclusion, M. Yen asked the Members of the Council to state their views with regard to the possibility of obtaining the withdrawal of the Japanese troops from Chinese territory.

M. Sato said that M. Yen had greatly exaggerated the number of Japanese soldiers in Manchuria. As regards the Shanghai incidents, he referred to the report of the Commission. Following proposals addressed to the Japanese Government by the Powers, negotiations were taking place at Tokio and Shanghai, and M. Sato hoped that they would soon be successful. The Japanese Government had no intention of pursuing the hostilities at Shanghai, and proposed that its troops should not advance beyond a line assigned as zone of protection. At the same time, Japan must insist that the opposing forces should withdraw and that a neutral zone should be set up, where order would be maintained by neutral authorities. The question which neutral authorities should be chosen must be decided on the spot. M. Sato further informed the Council that Admiral Nomura, of the Third Fleet, had reached Shanghai the day before with instructions, the object of which was to bring about the cessation of hostilities.

Sir John Simon (British Empire) said that, although the proposals put forward by the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy had not, unhappily, been the means of bringing about immediate agreement, these efforts were not to be regarded as entirely fruitless and without result. Information received as to the negotiations proceeding on the spot between local representatives of the Powers principally concerned was confirmed by the information received by the British representative, and the efforts which were thus being made were definitely related to the steps taken by the Powers. The co-operation on the spot of the local representatives of the Powers, including the United States, must be considered as a valuable and hopeful sign. After noting the assurances given by M. Sato that Japan desired to put an end to hostilities as soon as possible, and observing that the British Government felt the gravest anxiety at the situation, Sir John Simon concluded that his Government had put the whole of its local influence, in co-operation with that of the other Powers, at the service of the Council in order to assist to that end as far as possible.

* The Consul-General of the United States at Shanghai, M. Cunningham, wrote on February 8th that he agreed to the report as a whole.

The President, M. Paul-Boncour, noted that the procedure instituted under Article 15 had been applied as promptly as possible. A commission had been set up within twenty-four hours, and its first report had been received. Summarising the events of the past few days, he noted that the words of the Japanese representative, together with the information received, made it possible to entertain the hope that the principle of the termination of hostilities at Shanghai and of the establishment of a neutral zone had been agreed to by both parties, and that the only question that remained was that of settling the details.

The President therefore expressed the view that a continuation of the discussion would add nothing to the information already given, and that the Council, on the basis of the supplementary reports from the Shanghai Commission and explanations from the parties, would be in a position to do the whole of its duty.

M. Yen said that the statement mentioned in Article 15, paragraph 2, of the Covenant would immediately be forwarded by his Government.*

He then asked that the League should exercise its full powers under the Covenant with a view to the pacific settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute. The Japanese hostilities were, moreover, not confined to Shanghai. As regards the situation in that city, the Chinese Government had accepted all the proposals made by the Powers, while the Japanese Government had, in fact, only accepted two of them.

M. Sato replied that the Japanese Government had sent troops to Harbin to protect the six thousand Japanese nationals residing in that city. He denied that the boycott of Japanese wares constituted legitimate reprisals for Japanese action in Manchuria, as stated by M. Yen.

For a long time there had been an anti-foreign, and particularly an anti-Japanese, movement in China. If the Japanese Government had withdrawn its forces from Shanghai, the Japanese nationals in that city would have been exposed to the greatest danger, perhaps even to massacre. Japan had been obliged to take measures to protect her colony. In 1927, an anti-foreign movement had been directed against Great Britain and the United States. Japan had also suffered from that movement, and her remembrance of those events was such as to make her realise that she could not allow things to take their course. Japan had, moreover, the right by treaty to send cruisers to

Chinese waters, and was not the only nation doing so. If Japan did not succeed in defending her rights at Shanghai, it would be impossible to foresee what the result would be.

The President again urged the Japanese representative to agree that a neutral zone should be set up as rapidly as possible, and that it should be occupied by the international forces at Shanghai. This would ensure the cessation of hostilities, and also the restoration of order, which was in the special interest of the Japanese themselves, and of those other countries concerned in the negotiations.

On February 12th the Chinese representative addressed to the Secretary-General the following communication :

"With regard to the Sino-Japanese dispute, of which the Council has been seized under Articles 10, 11, and 15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, I have the honour to observe that, according to Article 15, paragraph 9, of the said Covenant, it is within the competence of the Council to refer the case to the Assembly. At the same time, it is also provided that the dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

"In view of the time limit imposed, the Chinese Government is constrained hereby to request that the said dispute be referred to the Assembly. If, however, it should be the pleasure and intention of the Council to refer the said dispute at its own initiative to the Assembly or in virtue of the general powers vested in it to summon the Assembly for consideration of the dispute, the Chinese Government will then be prepared to withdraw the request on its part."

On the same day the Shanghai Commission forwarded its second report, which stated that, since February 3rd, a state of open war existed, all pretence of truce having been abandoned.*

On February 16th, the Members of the Council other than the parties proceeded to a fresh exchange of views and decided, in the most friendly spirit, to address an urgent appeal to the Japanese Government. The text of the appeal is as follows :

"The President of the Council, on behalf of his colleagues, pointed out on January 29th in an appeal to both Parties, 'good relations between States could only be secured by co-operation and mutual respect, and that no permanent solution could be achieved by force, whether military or merely economic, and that the longer the present situation continued the wider the breach between the two peoples would become and the more difficult the solution would be, with all the disasters that would mean, not only to the two nations directly involved, but to the world in general.'

"The Members of the Council other than the Chinese and Japanese representatives feel con-

* M. Yen first sent a preliminary statement and later a fuller one.

* The third report was received on February 20th.

strained to-day to make a pressing appeal to the Government to recognise the very special responsibilities for forbearance and restraint which devolves upon it in the present conflict, in virtue of the position of Japan as a Member of the League of Nations and a permanent Member of its Council.

"The situation which has developed in the Far East during the past months will be fully studied by the Commission appointed with the consent of both Parties. But, since the Commission was set up, there have occurred and are still occurring events at and in the region of Shanghai which have intensified public anxiety, which endanger the lives and interests of the nationals of numerous countries, add to the unexampled difficulties with which the world is faced during the present crisis, and threaten to throw new and serious obstacles in the path of the Disarmament Conference.

"The twelve Members of the Council are far from disregarding the grievances advanced by Japan and throughout all these months have given her the full confidence which they owed to an associate of long standing who had ever been punctilious in the fulfilment of all her obligations and duties as a member of the community of nations. They cannot but regret, however, that she has not found it possible to make full use of the methods of peaceful settlement provided in the Covenant and recall once again the solemn undertaking of the Pact of Paris that the solution of international disputes shall never be sought by other than peaceful means. They cannot but recognise that, from the beginning of the conflict which is taking place on her territory, China has put her case in the hands of the League and agreed to accept its proposals for a peaceful settlement.

"The twelve Members of the Council recall the terms of Article 10 of the Covenant, by which all the Members of the League have undertaken to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all other Members. It is their friendly right to direct attention to this provision, particularly as it appears to them to follow that no infringement of the territorial integrity and no change in the political independence of any Member of the League brought about in disregard of this Article ought to be recognised as valid and effectual by the Members of the League of Nations.

"Japan has an incalculable responsibility before the public opinion of the world to be just and restrained in her relations with China. She has already acknowledged this responsibility in most solemn terms by becoming one of the signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, whereby the contracting Powers expressly agreed to respect the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial and administrative integrity of China. The twelve Members of the Council appeal to Japan's high sense of honour to recognise the obligations of her special position and of the confidence which the nations have placed in her as a partner in the organisation and maintenance of peace."

On February 23rd, in reply to this appeal, the Japanese representative sent the President of the Council a note from the Japanese Foreign

Minister, with an annex. This note, dated Tokio, February 23rd, reads as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge your note of the 16th February, 1932, addressed to the Ambassador of Japan at Brussels, the representative of Japan on the Council of the League of Nations, covering a communication from the twelve members of the Council of the League.

I must in the first place express my thanks to you for your courtesy in becoming intermediary of this communication which has had, as I need not say, my most earnest and immediate attention. I would ask you to express to your colleagues who collaborated in its composition my very real and sincere appreciation of the extremely courteous and sympathetic terms in which it is couched; terms which are flattering to the legitimate pride taken by the Japanese people in the record of their country as a devoted friend of peace.

No one can read their statement without being profoundly impressed by their keen realisation of the perils and difficulties of the situation and by the generous anxiety which is apparent on their part to leave no avenue unexplored, by which the unhappy state of affairs now unfortunately prevailing in the neighbourhood of Shanghai might be remedied.

I cannot but feel, however, that they have addressed their moving appeal to a quarter, where it is not necessary. They are "forcing open door." It lies in the hands of the Chinese leaders to bring about the discontinuance of the armed conflicts which Japan would never have begun, and which she intensely deplores and dislikes.

Your Excellency will find enclosed a statement by my Government in which their views are set forward in detail, and which I shall be obliged if you will be good enough to lay before those Members of the Council who participated in the statement transmitted by you as above. I trust, however, that I may be allowed without being misunderstood to depreciate the growth of the practice of substituting for discussions by the Council of the League, discussions by a select Committee of whatever composition.

This appears to be in accordance neither with the spirit nor the letter of the Covenant, which implies that the discussions arising out of every case submitted to the Council will be conducted in the presence of all the members—whatever weight may be attached to their respective votes in the result. Whilst conscious of the fact that the Powers are actuated by the best motives, and that they are hampered by very considerable difficulties, my Government cannot but decline to recognise that these regular and repeated *ex parte* discussions are really compatible with the procedure of the League. The public naturally confuse them with the proceedings of the Council, with most unfortunate results.

As a matter of courtesy, however, I have willingly responded to the individual desires of your colleagues, by drawing up the statement above referred to for submission through your good offices to each of these Powers, whose strenuous efforts in the cause of humanity and peace I desire gratefully to acknowledge. Japan is only too anxious to put a stop to the conflict.

The following declaration accompanied the note.

The Japanese Government cannot understand why an appeal of the twelve Powers should be addressed to Japan, as though she were able, by exercise of some unspecified act of forbearance, immediately to bring about the cessation of the alarming situation at Shanghai.

It is to the Chinese, as the attacking party, to whom the appeal might be effectively made. At the very least, it is impossible to see why it should be made to Japan alone. It does not appear to be suggested that Japan was wrong in resisting the attack made on her marines, and unless that is assumed, why is she called upon to discontinue that resistance?

2. If the note had any positive suggestion to offer, such as the establishment of a "safety zone" adjoining Shanghai, with a view to effective separation of the Chinese from the Japanese forces, or indeed any other guarantee for cessation of conflict, the appeal would be intelligible. But no such suggestion is made. The Japanese forces are expected to lay down their arms, or to withdraw to Japan to allow the Chinese troops to occupy the international settlement—for that would be the inevitable result. If it is said that the Chinese would be afraid to put themselves thus definitely in the wrong, the answer is that they already have done so twice; moreover the storming of Shanghai could always be attributed to irresponsible soldiery.

3. A strong exception must be taken to the assumption that China is willing to resort only to peaceful measures for the solution of the dispute, while Japan is not so disposed. China may undoubtedly and formally declare her willingness to take none but peaceful measures, but deeds speak louder than words. There is no possible reason why aggressive measures of China should be condoned, because of her pacific declarations, while defensive measures of Japan are branded as hostile. While Japan is daily sustaining losses of life and treasure through Chinese military attacks, it is distinctly surprising to be told that China is willing to settle all disputes by peaceful means!

The Japanese Government do not understand the observation that "Japan has not found it possible to have recourse unreservedly to methods of pacific settlement provided for in the Covenant of the League of Nations." Japan has participated unreservedly in the process of settlement provided for in the Covenant; it surely cannot be supposed that these methods exclude interim measures of self-defence which are interdicted by no resolution of the League, or that these methods compel her to accept a departure from their own express provisions, in the shape of a majority decision.

It is a universally accepted axiom that all treaties of pacific settlement leave unimpaired the right of legitimate self-defence! The gravamen of the regret appears rather to be that Japan has not unreservedly put herself in the hands of her colleagues; and this with great respect she was legally and morally entitled to decline to do. Legally because she was under no promise to do otherwise. Morally because although reposing greatest confidence in their judgment and goodwill,

she believes that she is naturally and necessarily in a far better position to appreciate the facts than any distant Power can possibly be.

4. The appeal invokes Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The measures of Japan, strictly defensive, do not infringe the provisions of that Article. That they do not do so is illustrated by the fact that neither when strong reinforcements were despatched by other Powers five years ago to defend Shanghai, nor when American and British forces bombarded Nanking, nor on various other occasions which will readily be recalled, was any question raised by any Power concerning this provision of the Covenant. It is a very proper provision; but it does not exclude self-defence, nor does it make China a "chartered libertine," free to attack other countries without their having any right to repel the attack.

5. As Japan does not, any more than it was contemplated on those occasions, contemplate any attack on territorial integrity or independence of a member of the League of Nations, it is superfluous to say that the bearing of the observation that attacks of such a character made in defiance of Article 10 of the Covenant cannot be recognised as valid and effective, is notably obscure to the Japanese Government. They take this occasion of once more firmly and emphatically declaring that Japan entertains no territorial or political ambitions whatsoever in China.

6. The Japanese Government are also unable to suppose that the duty of justice and moderation towards China is one which flows from the "Nine Power" Treaty of Washington. The duty of justice and moderation towards all Powers is entirely independent of the treaty, and it is most willingly and gladly accepted by Japan who is equally appreciative of the justice and moderation shown to herself by others. Japan is fully prepared to stand by all her obligations under the "Nine Power" Treaty, but it is conceived that it would be inconvenient and improper to enter upon a discussion of its terms with Powers other than those who are Parties to that engagement and in the absence of some who are Parties.

7. Finally, it must be emphasised that the Japanese Government do not and cannot consider that China is an "organised people" within the meaning of the Covenant of the League of Nations. China has, it is true, been treated in the past by common consent as if the expression connoted an organised people. But fictions cannot last for ever nor can they be tolerated when they become grave sources of practical danger. Time has inevitably come when realities, rather than fictions, must be reckoned with. The general desire to see China happy, prosperous and united, has led the world to treat her as united in a way in which in sober fact she was not. Its population is not organised except in patches. If Japan had no interests there, it might be possible to go on indefinitely respecting the fiction that the region is occupied by an "organised people."

Japan, however, has enormous interests there. It is impossible any longer to treat the chaos in China as if it were the order. The authorities which subsist in various parts of China derive theirs simply from the fact that they do exercise

control within limited areas. But they can have no title nor extend their control beyond them. This anomalous state of things cannot but profoundly modify the application to Chinese affairs of the Covenant of the League. Instead of a single organised people we have there various rudimentary nuclei of organisations. The Japanese Government do not pretend that it is easy to work out implications and consequences of this situation. It is not easy, but it is necessary. We must face the facts; and the fundamental fact is that there is no unified control in China and no authority which is entitled to claim entire control in China.

8. The considerations have now been stated in short compass which this Government desire to adduce in answer to the appeal to them, an appeal of which they keenly feel the generosity and lofty humanity. It has been shown that the Powers, in appealing to Japan, are forcing an open door, and that it is the aggressive Chinese forces to whom the appeal should be addressed. It has been suggested that to be really useful and practical, the appeal should comprise some specific plan, such as creation of a "safety zone." The charge has been rebutted that Japan is less disposed than China to settle matters by peaceful means. Lastly, it has been shown that China cannot be dealt with on any other footing than that of fact and reality, and that the fact is that China does not constitute an "organised people." It remains for the Japanese Government to repeat their deep sense of the high purpose and philanthropic energy which have actuated the Powers in taking this unusual step.

It is their sincere belief that on reflection those Powers will come to coincide with the views now advanced, and it is earnestly hoped that they will not relax their utmost efforts to induce the Chinese to refrain from aggressive acts such as those which have precipitated armed conflicts of the past five months.

Japan altogether repudiated the stigma which is attempted in some quarters to be attached to her, of favouring and desiring war. Her people yield to none in their detestation of war, and its inevitable horrors. If the efforts of the twelve Powers should succeed in bringing about a pacific attitude on the part of China, nowhere will more sincere delight be felt than in Japan.

Before the arrival of the Japanese note the Chinese representative informed the Council, on February 18th, that the military negotiations between Chinese and Japanese commanders at Shanghai had failed. The Japanese had sent an ultimatum demanding that, before 5 p.m. on February 20th, the Chinese forces should be withdrawn to a distance of twenty kilometres to the north, east, and west of the International Settlement, failing which the Japanese commander would take the necessary action. The Chinese representative accordingly asked for a meeting of the Council.

The Council met on February 19th.

The President said that he would submit to the Council a draft resolution concerning the steps to be taken in response to the Chinese

Government's request that the dispute should be submitted to the Assembly. He invited the parties to furnish the necessary explanations regarding the impending events at Shanghai.

M. Yen said that forty thousand Japanese soldiers and forty Japanese warships were at present in the Shanghai area. According to the report of the Consular Commission, a state of war existed in Shanghai since February 3rd. Despite the appeal addressed to the Japanese Government three days before by the Members of the Council other than the parties, negotiations had failed, and the Japanese had replied by an ultimatum that was on the point of expiring. A great battle was impending, because the Japanese had demanded that the Chinese troops should give way on their own national territory and withdraw, while the Japanese soldiers were to remain in their positions. He asked the Council, in virtue of its powers under the Covenant, to take conservatory measures in order to prevent bloodshed.

M. Sato replied that his country had made every effort to stop hostilities, but that these efforts had been unsuccessful. A critical moment had been reached. Conservatory measures, if they could have been devised, ought to have been proposed long ago. Since the Council was about to adopt a resolution transferring the question to the Assembly, the Japanese representative said that he desired on this final occasion to give the Council as full an explanation as possible, so that when the matter came before the Assembly the latter might be in possession of all the facts. The origin of the difficulties between China and Japan was that, for more than ten years, China had been in a state of civil war and a condition of anarchy. The preamble to the Covenant specified distinctly that it applied to organised peoples. If the difficulties which had arisen between Japan and China had arisen with another country with a properly organised administration, Japan would have accepted any peaceful settlement of the dispute; she could have observed literally the provisions of the Covenant. But even States with interests in China had been obliged to resort to measures which would not have been permitted if the same difficulties had occurred in a well-organised country. If, to-day, Japan were censured for having committed acts of aggression, similar acts should have been censured when committed by certain other Powers with interests in China. Had the position been normal in China, the Powers which, in the past, had had recourse to extreme measures would have appealed to the Council to settle their disputes

by pacific methods. The fact that they were unable to do so showed that the Council could not in this case apply the Covenant to its full extent, and in accordance with the strict interpretation of its wording.

Japan to-day was under the same imperious necessity. Retirement from Shanghai would mean for Japan the abandonment of the defence of her rights and interests. No Government could agree to that. Recalling the importance of the Japanese interests at Shanghai, M. Sato declared that his country could not entrust the protection of these interests to the Chinese authorities, or to anyone. Had the League or the Council been able to devise effective measures to safeguard these interests and the interests of the other Powers, Japan would not have been compelled to employ methods which various Powers felt constrained to employ some years ago.

Examining the situation in Manchuria, the Japanese delegate stated that, on February 17th a certain number of persons had formed an executive committee of the North-Eastern Provinces, had proclaimed the independence of these provinces, and the breaking of relations with the central Chinese Government. He added that there was no need for surprise at the use of the word "independent," for the Chinese, this word had a different meaning from that attached to it by Europeans or Americans. Independence in China was synonymous with autonomy. Japan had suffered severely in Manchuria from the arbitrary measures taken by the Mukden authorities, and for this reason felt much sympathy with the motto, "Manchuria for the Manchus." When China had a properly organised and co-ordinated central Government, Manchuria would perhaps enter into negotiations with that Government with a view to settling her status.

Japan had often been charged with failing to conform to the Council resolutions of September and December; but these resolutions provided for the withdrawal of the Japanese forces into the railway zone as soon as the life and property of the Japanese nationals in Manchuria had been safeguarded. The abnormal situation had, however, continued, and Japan had been unable to withdraw her troops. The anti-Japanese movement had developed in China. Japan had lost all trade with China; her place had been taken by others.

Unfortunately, Japan was in an unfavourable position, more particularly as regards emigration. There was no country, or almost no country, to which she could send her emigrants. In America all countries save one or two were

closed to the Japanese; the same applied to Oceania and South Africa. Japan had been compelled to accept this situation. When she entered the League, she had made an appeal for equitable treatment for her people and her trade, but had immediately encountered barriers she had not been able to cross. Japan had been obliged to accept the *status quo*. She was subjected to treatment which was derogatory to her dignity, and against which she constantly protested. Driven from Central and Southern China, where she had lost all her trade, she was obliged to seek a solution and look near Japan, in Manchuria.

Japan had no territorial designs in Manchuria, but desired to preserve there a field of action for the Japanese and respect of the principle of the open door. Foreign capital would be welcome, for Japanese capital alone would not suffice to open up so vast an area.

As for Shanghai, Japan had but one desire—to protect herself. As soon as that had been achieved, the Japanese troops would withdraw, and leave it to neutral forces to create the neutral zone which would ultimately be set up.

M. Yen recalled that only four or five hours remained in which to prevent the battle. He admitted that there was some disorder in China, but recalled that that country was as large as Europe, and had a population of four hundred million inhabitants. Moreover, China had been an absolute monarchy, and had been suddenly transformed into a republic. The necessary readjustment could not take place without a certain amount of commotion. The question of the good organisation of the state had been raised; but even in Japan the army and the navy were beyond government control; Japanese diplomats had made promises to the Council which had been broken the next day, Chinchow had been occupied, despite solemn promises to two or three Powers not to do so; Chinese had been massacred in Japan and in Korea; moreover, if China had no organised government, why did the Japanese Government insist on direct negotiations with the Chinese Government?

If there was disorder in China, a large part of the blame must be put on the shoulders of Japan, because she had helped one party against the other from year to year. Japan did not want a united and strong China; but, owing to the aggression, China had never been more united than she was to-day.

After denying that other Powers had perpetrated in China acts of aggression similar to those committed by Japan, the Chinese representative drew attention to the fact that Japan was fighting a country suffering from

terrible floods, without having declared war, taking all the advantages of war and refusing to shoulder its responsibilities.

Again, although the Japanese representative had stated that Japan needed an outlet for her surplus population, it was none the less true that in Manchuria, despite official encouragement and the supply of funds, there were only two hundred thousand Japanese nationals, while a million Chinese settled there every year. At the present day Manchuria was purely Chinese, while the majority of the Manchus, one of the five races of China, were scattered all over the Republic.

The Chinese representative had been gratified to hear the Japanese representative on several occasions state that his country had no territorial designs in Manchuria; he would, however, observe that a similar statement had some years ago been made regarding Korea, and that Korea was at present an integral part of the Japanese Empire.

In conclusion, the Chinese representative again appealed to the Council to take conservatory measures to prevent the bloodshed which was about to begin at Shanghai.

The Japanese representative stated that his country, far from desiring to foment trouble in China, merely desired order and calm.

The President said that since the Council was about to summon the Assembly, it would no longer have the duty or the possibility of deciding on the substance of the dispute. He would ask the Japanese representative to believe that the Council had overlooked none of the considerations he had put before it. The recommendations which the Council would have made with regard to the substance of the dispute would have shown—as would those made by the Assembly—the greatest impartiality, and also the fullest understanding of any very special conditions in the relations of the two countries concerned in the dispute. It was for the League, within the limits of the Covenant, to adapt its decisions to meet those divers conditions.

The Council was now in the presence of an ultimatum which would perhaps expire in a few hours. Since the Japanese representative had, once again, given the assurance that his country intended to respect Article 10 of the Covenant, the President asked whether there was not an appalling inconsistency between Japan's freedom from territorial interests and the fact that a battle was about to take place whereas, whatever the outcome, it followed that the Japanese would evacuate the field as soon as they had achieved their object—the safeguarding of the security of their nationals.

In these circumstances the President wondered whether it would not be possible to agree at once upon the creation of a neutral zone. He urgently appealed to the Japanese representative to prevent the ultimatum expiring within a few hours.

Addressing the Chinese representative, the President recalled that conservatory measures must be the outcome of an agreement between the parties. At the present moment an agreement could only be adopted on the spot. The Council had not resigned to another the duty of taking steps, but when the British representative had informed it that negotiations were proceeding, it had placed its hopes in the success of those negotiations. The President urged that the ultimatum should be extended long enough to allow the negotiations to be reopened.

After the other Members of the Council had associated themselves with the words of the President, the Japanese representative said that he had listened with emotion to this sincere and urgent appeal, and again gave an assurance that his country could not but rejoice if it were possible to maintain peace. He would, therefore, forward the appeal to his Government. He must, however, express regret that the Council did not think it possible to make as urgent an appeal to the other party. For several weeks the situation of the Japanese at Shanghai had been distressing, they had been constantly menaced. To abandon the position assigned to Japan would have been completely to abandon a position acquired with much energy and effort. Should the Council recommend Japan to withdraw, the Japanese representative would be unable to forward its request to his Government. At this critical moment there was one thing he could still do. The cessation of firing was the first desiderata, but that depended on both parties. The Council would be taking useful action if it addressed as pressing an appeal to the other party.

The President replied that if he had ventured to make a more pressing appeal to Japan, it was because all prospect of mediation and negotiation depended on the ultimatum and the Japanese commander. He had, however, no need to say that he made an equally pressing appeal to the Chinese representative to assure the Council that, if the ultimatum were prolonged, the armistice would, as a first condition be scrupulously respected by both parties and that, subsequently, the Chinese Government, like the Japanese Government, would give its most careful consideration to any proposals advanced by the representatives of the Powers at Shanghai.

The Council then adopted the following

resolution, by which the question of the dispute was submitted to the Assembly :

" The Council,

(1) Considering the request submitted by the representative of China, under the provisions of paragraph 9 of Article 15 of the Covenant, to the effect that the Sino-Japanese dispute should be referred to the Assembly :

Decides that the said dispute is referred to the Assembly in accordance with Article 15, paragraph 9, of the Covenant.

(2) Considering that delegations from almost every Member of the League are now present in Geneva in order to take part in the Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments, thereby enabling the Assembly to meet at short notice.

The Council,

Decides that a meeting of the Assembly shall be held on March 3rd.

(3) Notes that the measures which have already been instituted in order to obtain information necessary for the consideration of the dispute will be continued.

(4) Requests the parties to the dispute to use all diligence in communicating to the Secretary-General, for the use of the Assembly, the statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers as provided for in Article 15, paragraph 2.

(5) The duty of the Council to continue its work for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the Covenant remains unaffected by the present decision."

During the following days hostilities developed in the Shanghai area.

On February 29th the Council met again.

Sir John Simon informed his colleagues that his Government had received fresh information from its representative at Shanghai. The commanders or representatives of the Japanese and Chinese forces had met the day before on board the British flagship, and in the presence of Admiral Sir Howard Kelly, to consider the possibility of arranging for a cessation of hostilities. According to the report of Admiral Kelly, agreement had been reached on the principle of mutual and simultaneous withdrawal on their side, and there appeared to have been detailed discussions as to how the evacuated area would best be controlled with the assistance of neutrals. These proposals had been forwarded to Tokio and Nanking.

The President then made the following statement.

1. The imminence of hostilities on the largest scale in the Shanghai region between Chinese and Japanese forces, with the inevitable consequence of heavy loss of life and further embitterment of feeling, makes it at this critical moment the duty of all of us to lose no opportunity of seeking means by which this deplorable armed conflict between two Members of the League may be suspended and a way of peace may be found and followed. The news that we have received from the British Representative that conversa-

tions actually took place yesterday at Shanghai with a view to making arrangements for a cessation of hostilities, and that the proposed arrangements have been referred to the respective Governments is welcomed by us all and the Council of the League is ready to make its contribution towards the consolidation of peaceful conditions in the way and at the time which is most useful.

2. The President has therefore called together his colleagues on the Council for the purpose of laying before them a proposal which might serve to this end. For its effective execution, this proposal will require not only the acceptance of the Governments of China and Japan, but the co-operation on the spot of the other principal Powers who have special interests in the Shanghai Settlements, and whose representatives are therefore readily available to make the local contribution of their friendly aid which is no less necessary than the positive and sincere agreement of the Chinese and Japanese authorities to the plan proposed.

3. This plan is as follows :—

(1) A Conference to be immediately set up in Shanghai composed of representatives of the Governments of China and Japan together with representatives of the other Powers above referred to for the purpose of bringing about a final conclusion of fighting and the restoration of peaceful conditions in the Shanghai area.

(2) The conference would be undertaken on the basis (a) that Japan has no political or territorial designs and no intention of establishing a Japanese settlement in Shanghai or of otherwise advancing the exclusive interests of the Japanese, and (b) that China enters the conference on the basis that the safety and integrity of the International and French Settlements must be preserved under arrangements which will secure these areas and their residents from danger.

(3) The meeting of this conference is of course subject to the making of local arrangements for a cessation of hostilities. The Council trusts that this will very speedily be brought about. It is proposed that the military, naval, and civilian authorities of the other principal Powers represented in Shanghai will render all possible assistance in consolidating the arrangements.

4. To this proposal, which is aimed at the immediate re-establishment of peace in the Shanghai area, without prejudice to or qualification of any position previously taken up by the League of Nations or any Power in relation to Sino-Japanese affairs, the President desires, in the name of himself and of his colleagues, to invite the adherence and co-operation both of China and Japan and of the other Powers referred to, whose local position enables them to make a special contribution to the common purpose of stopping armed conflict and restoring peace.

M. Grandi (Italy) immediately assured the President of his entire approval. As representative of a Power with special interests in the Shanghai Settlements, he would add that Italy's collaboration in the plan was already definitely assured.

Sir John Simon said that the British Government would instruct its representatives at Shanghai to co-operate with the other Powers. His Government would do this in its character as a Member of the League resolved to support its moral authority and sustain its influence in the work of maintaining and restoring peaceful relations.

But there was another Government whose citizens had great interests in the International Settlement, and whose devotion to the cause of peace and desire to promote a just conclusion of the conflict were well known: the United States of America. The British representative was able to announce that he had been in close consultation with the American Government, and was authorised to communicate the assurances of the United States that it was prepared to associate itself with the step now being taken and to instruct its representatives in Shanghai to co-operate with the Members of the League in the fullest measure in carrying out the proposals formulated by the President.

Speaking as French representative, the President said that he was authorised to intimate his Government's adhesion to the plan and to promise the same support.

M. Sato said that he was not yet authorised to inform the Council as to the details of the negotiations which had taken place at Shanghai; he agreed to the plan proposed by the President, subject to the approval of his Government, to whom he would forward it without delay. He made the following statement:

(1) In the Shanghai question the sole aim of the Japanese Government is to remove from the International Concession, and also from its own nationals, an imminent danger and to restore peaceful conditions.

(2) The Japanese Government will be prepared to co-operate with other Powers with a view to settling the situation at Shanghai as soon as calm is re-established under conditions such as will guarantee the security of the Concession and the Japanese nationals. For this purpose and particularly with a view to ensuring the future security of foreigners in the Shanghai region the Japanese Government will have no objection to the opening in that city of a round table conference at which there will be represented foreign Powers who have interests at Shanghai.

(3) The Japanese Government has no intention of taking advantage of the present situation in order to realise political or territorial ambitions in that region. It has no wish to establish a Japanese concession at Shanghai or to obtain exclusive advantages there for the Japanese. It desires to maintain and strengthen the international character of Shanghai.

(4) News has been published in the Press according to which the Japanese Government is stated to be contemplating the establishment

of neutral zones around some of the chief Chinese cities. This in no wise represents the intentions of the Japanese Government.

Mr. Yen said that the Chinese Government and people appreciated very sincerely any effort on the part of the League and of friendly Powers not Members of the League, particularly the United States, to bring about an immediate cessation of hostilities and to prepare the way for a just and permanent settlement of the dispute. He read the following telegram, which he had just received from his Government:

"Last night Admiral Kelly, of the British Navy invited Dr. Wellington Koo and other Chinese and Japanese authorities to a meeting. Admiral Kelly proposed cessation of hostilities, and simultaneous withdrawal of Chinese troops to Nanzhang (a town on the Shanghai-Nanking Railway) and the Japanese to embark. The withdrawal of both sides to be supervised by neutrals. Chinese authorities find proposal reasonable and acceptable."

In these circumstances, he would gladly transmit the proposals to his Government and would strongly urge it to accept them.

M. Sato explained that as soon as he was authorised by his Government to give the Council details concerning the arrangements reached at Shanghai he would not fail to do so.

M. von Weizsäcker (Germany) said that all must hope that the negotiations and the subsequent measures would be crowned with immediate success.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) thought that at such a time everyone desired to contribute, whether in small or in great measure, to the success of the efforts that were being made. To some of the Members this contribution would consist in setting aside a special preference to see Powers other than those with immediate interests on the spot associated in the Shanghai Conference. He expressed the hope that the negotiations might be successful in such time as to enable the Assembly to be confronted with this happy beginning.

After thanking those of his colleagues who had explicitly acceded to his proposals, the President drew special attention to the words used by the British representative, who had established a close connection (as did also the proposal) between the cessation of hostilities and the proposed Conference at Shanghai. It was quite clear that the Conference would be purposeless, save in the silence of arms and with hostilities suspended. The President associated himself with the desire expressed by the Spanish representative that hostilities might cease soon enough for the Assembly to open

under happier auspices than might have been contemplated.

* * *

The Commission set up under the Council resolution of December 10th, 1931, whose Chairman, Lord Lytton, and other European members embarked at La Havre and Plymouth on February 3rd and 4th arrived on February 29th at Tokio, via New York and San Francisco.

2. MEMEL.

Request of the German Government.

On February 8th, under Article 17, paragraph 1, of the Memel Convention* (Paris, 1924), the German Government drew the Council's attention to the following circumstances: On February 6th, the Governor of the Memel territory, M. Merkys, had deposed the President of the Memel Directorate, and had had him arrested and imprisoned in barracks. The Counsellor, M. Tolischus, had been entrusted with the temporary conduct of the business of the President of the Directorate. The German Government considered these measures as a breach of the Statute of the Memel territory which, in Article 17, paragraph 2, lays down that the President shall hold office so long as he possesses the confidence of the Chamber of Representatives. This condition, the German Government said, was fulfilled in the case of President Boettcher. The German Government asked that the question should be considered as urgent and included in the Council agenda.

On February 9th, the Lithuanian Government, notified of the communication of the German Government, replied as follows: Having learned that the President of the Directorate, accompanied by two members of the Diet, had visited Berlin without the knowledge of the Lithuanian Government, to conduct negotiations with the German authorities, the Lithuanian Government had been compelled to cancel his appointment; as the President had refused to comply with the Governor's decision, he had

been provisionally held in custody to prevent disturbances but had been released on February 8th. The Governor was in touch with the President of the Diet with a view to the appointment of a President of the Directorate enjoying the confidence of the Diet. The Lithuanian Government considered that the measures it had been obliged to take were in no sense in conflict with the provisions of the Convention or Statute of Memel.

The Council met on February 13th. The German representative, M. von Bülow, asked that the Council should take immediate measures to put an end to a situation created in Memel by the action of the Lithuanian Government, which, from the legal point of view, constituted in the German Government's opinion, a flagrant violation of the Statute of the territory, and, from the political point of view, was such as to justify the gravest concern.

M. von Bülow then gave an account of the incident. M. Boettcher, President of the Memel Directorate, had, he said, been deposed by the Lithuanian Government in violation of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Statute, which laid down that the President should hold office as long as he possessed the confidence of the Chamber of Representatives. The other two members of the Directorate, M. Podzus and M. Szigaud, had, despite their protests, also been dismissed. The Governor had asserted that he had been obliged to cancel M. Boettcher's appointment on account of a journey to Berlin which he had undertaken without his knowledge, accompanied by two members of the Diet, in order to negotiate with the German authorities. The Lithuanian Government had never given its reasons for the dismissal of the other members of the Directorate. As a matter of fact, M. von Bülow said, Mr. Boettcher had gone to Berlin with two assistants, in a purely private capacity and not as an official delegate. They had confined themselves to examining the possibility of facilitating the export of agricultural products, as is frequently done by representatives of economic interests.

But the Governor, who, for a long time past, had viewed the Directorate with disfavour, took this opportunity as a pretext to bring a serious charge against the Directorate, and requested M. Boettcher to resign. On January 25th, the Chamber of Representatives defeated, by a large majority, the motion of lack of confidence put forward against the three members of the Directorate; on February 6th, the Governor, after consulting the Lithuanian Government, removed M. Boettcher from office and arrested him. The other two members of the Directorate were prevented from performing their duties,

* Article 17 reads as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties declare that any Member of the Council of the League of Nations shall be entitled to draw the attention of the Council to any infraction of the provisions of the present Convention.

"In the event of any difference of opinion in regard to questions of law or of fact concerning these provisions between the Lithuanian Government and any of the Principal Allied Powers, Members of the Council of the League of Nations, such difference shall be regarded as a dispute of an international character under the terms of Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Lithuanian Government agrees that all disputes of this kind shall, if the other party so requests, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice. There shall be no appeal from the Permanent Court's decision, which shall have the force and value of a decision rendered in virtue of Article 13 of the Covenant."

and a provisional Directorate was constituted. At the same time, there was considerable interference with the operations of the Memel police, and deputies who desired to leave for Geneva to attend the Council meeting were prevented from doing so.

According to M. von Bülow, the incident in question was only one link in the long series of measures from which the Memel population had suffered for years. Since January 27th the territory had been subject to the régime of a state of war. Liberty of the press and freedom of association were most rigorously restricted, and the population, which was of German speech, race, and culture, was suffering from political oppression, of which it was impossible to form any idea.

In these circumstances M. von Bülow requested the Council to take the necessary measures to redress the breach of law which had been committed by the Lithuanian Government and to safeguard in future the autonomy of the territory.

The Lithuanian representative made two preliminary observations. The incident, he said, affected relations between Lithuania and Germany only in so far as the former had been obliged to protest against the latter's share in the acts of the President of the Directorate. This aspect of the question was, however, not under discussion. The second observation was that the German Government, as Member of the Council, had the right to draw the Council's attention to any breach of the Memel Convention. As regards, however, the German Government's application of the procedure ensuing from Article 17 of the Memel Convention, Dr. Zaunius made express reservations. The German Government had not confined itself to drawing the Council's attention to a breach of the Memel Statute, but had further alleged that the incidents in question had created a particularly serious situation in the territory. Even if a serious situation existed, and that was not the case, M. Zaunius denied that this would constitute an infraction of the Memel Convention. The Lithuanian Government, he said, could only consent to take part in a discussion on questions which had been regularly reported to the Council in conformity with Article 17, paragraph 1, of the Paris Convention, and with the relevant rules prescribed by the Council. It further denied that the Government of the Reich was entitled to extend the discussion to cover the whole range of the policy which the Lithuanian Government saw fit to pursue in the Memel territory, and which was dictated by the vital interests of

the Lithuanian State as a whole, and by the desire scrupulously to observe all the international obligations which it had signed. The only subject that Government could discuss was an alleged breach of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Statute.

As regards the specific incident of the deposition of the President, Dr. Zaunius said that, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, the official character of Dr. Boettcher's journey to Berlin was established by various sources of information in a manner which was not open to question. The negotiations, he said, had not been confined to purely agricultural and economic interests, but, according to information which appeared in the German press, had possibly concerned certain relations between the German Government and the population of the Memel territory.

The Lithuanian representative then set forth certain incidents prior to Dr. Boettcher's journey to Berlin which, M. Zaunius considered, alone would have justified an appeal by the Lithuanian Government under Article 11 of the Covenant and afforded clear proof that the Lithuanian Government had carried the spirit of tolerance to the extreme limit. It was, therefore, he said, impossible for it not to react against the provocation offered by certain elements in the territory with the connivance of the German Government. In removing M. Boettcher, the Lithuanian Government had no political design, and it was not its purpose to do anything to infringe the autonomy granted the territory. The Governor was at present persevering in his efforts to form a new Directorate which would possess the confidence of the Diet.

Passing to the legal aspects of the question, Dr. Zaunius drew attention to the fact that the autonomy granted Memel covered the subjects enumerated in Article 5 of the Statute, and that the Governor's action in relieving M. Boettcher of his office did not in any way affect the jurisdiction of the local powers in this respect.

As regards the alleged breach by the Lithuanian Government of Article 17 of the Statute, the Lithuanian Government had no desire to prejudge the question whether in normal circumstances the Governor had or had not the right to remove the President of the Directorate. The case of M. Boettcher was in a different category, his powers were very clearly defined in Article 17, paragraph 1, of the Statute, and by arrogating to himself prerogatives (negotiations with foreign governments) reserved solely for the Lithuanian Government,

M. Boettcher had violated the Memel Statute. The Lithuanian Government, he said, was firmly convinced that, in the abnormal and exceptional situation created by M. Boettcher and the German Government, the act of the Governor of Memel in revoking his previous appointment of M. Boettcher did not infringe any of the provisions of the Convention; on the contrary, the Governor of Memel had put a stop to activities directed against the legal statute set up by the Convention.

Dr. Zaunius then replied to various points set forth by M. von Bülow (the purely German character of the inhabitants which he denied, the situation in the territory, etc.). In conclusion, he said that the Lithuanian Government was fully conscious of its duties and responsibilities and would scrupulously respect the obligations resulting from the treaties it had signed.

The Council resumed its discussions on February 20th, when the rapporteur, M. Colban (Norway), submitted his report.

The rapporteur observed that there was an essential difference of fundamentals, and that the facts cited in regard to M. Boettcher's dismissal were set out differently by the two parties.

The Council had, he said, been able to note with satisfaction the Lithuanian Government's assurance that it intended scrupulously to fulfil all its international obligations arising under the texts applicable to Memel; it had also heard the Lithuanian representative's statement that the Governor of Memel was endeavouring to establish a directorate according to the conditions laid down in the Statute. It was, however, of paramount importance that the present abnormal situation, which called for urgent steps to prevent its aggravation, should be dealt with as soon as possible and that a directorate enjoying the confidence of the Chamber of Representatives should present itself before that body without delay. The Council could not be too solicitous to see the normal working of the Statute re-established throughout the territory.

As for the lawfulness of M. Boettcher's dismissal, the rapporteur considered that no opinion could be expressed on this point until the question of the Governor's right to dismiss the Directorate had been settled. Even if it were admitted that the Governor were empowered to dismiss the Directorate, it would be necessary to consider what exactly were the circumstances and whether they warranted the exercise of this right.

With a view to settling the two questions at issue, the rapporteur hesitated to suggest that the Council should, by a majority vote, seek the advisory opinion of the Court; if, however, it should seem that unanimity could not be secured, he would merely remind the Council that the Powers signatories to the Memel Convention were entitled to deal with questions of law as between themselves on the basis of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

The Lithuanian representative said that he would agree to the report, with the exception of the points concerning the improvement of the present situation and establishment of a Directorate. These suggestions, he thought, went beyond the powers conferred on the Council in Article 17 of the Convention. The Governor of Memel was making every effort to set up a Directorate in accordance with the conditions of the Statute, and this body would very shortly appear before the Chamber. He added that in view of the attitude of certain members of the majority who had been influenced from abroad, an appeal to the country in accordance with the terms of the Statute might ultimately become necessary.

The German representative, M. von Bülow, recalled that the Council had had to consider the Memel question on several occasions. The Memel territory was of special importance to Germany, the population having been German for seven hundred years. For this reason, the principal Allied Powers, signatories of the Memel Convention of 1924, had decided to accord Memel special rights of autonomy. But this autonomy had suffered considerably since its introduction, and since 1927 the territory was under martial law. After again setting forth the facts concerning the dismissal of M. Boettcher, M. von Bülow pointed out that, after the legal Directorate had been replaced by a Directorate of Lithuanian nationality, the Diet had refused to express its confidence in this Directorate by its vote of February 17th (twenty-two votes to four, two members being absent and one abstaining).

As regards the possibility of dissolving the Diet, the German representative affirmed that the Directorate could not legally do so, for if this were to take place, it would constitute a new infraction of the Memel Statute. After expressing his regret that the Council had not been able to hear members of the Diet whom the Lithuanian Government had forcibly prevented from coming to Geneva, M. von Bülow declared that M. Colban's report was the very least that the Council could accept.

All the European countries, including Lithuania, had signed the Optional Clause concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court and thereby were bound to settle all legal disputes before the Court. In these circumstances, the German representative protested against the attitude of the Lithuanian Government, which he said he failed to understand. Under Article 17 of the Convention, the Council guaranteed the application of the Statute; it should, accordingly, be in a position to redress any illegal action. Failure of the League mechanism in such a matter would have disastrous effects upon public opinion. He called upon the four Allied Powers, signatories of the Memel Convention, to realise their responsibilities, and to avail themselves of their right under Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Convention to bring the case at once before the Court.

The rapporteur denied that there had been any question of failure. The Council had certain well-defined powers under Article 17, paragraph 1, of the Memel Convention, and had followed the prescribed procedure. One procedure had, perhaps, been exhausted, but the second paragraph of the same article prescribed another procedure, which might be followed simultaneously or, if necessary, after the first had been exhausted.

The Lithuanian representative replied to certain statements of the German representative. He protested, in particular, against what had been said regarding his Government's attitude towards the question of the advisory opinion of the Permanent Court. The Court, he said, was not to be approached by the method chosen by the German representative, as this would imply modifying the Memel Convention. The Lithuanian Government was merely anxious that the procedure laid down in Article 17 of the Convention should be observed. He refused to extend the discussion to various questions raised by the German Government, reminding the Council that the only item on the agenda was that of the alleged infraction of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Memel Statute.

The British representative, the Marquess of Londonderry, associated himself with the observations of the rapporteur in regard to the immediate constitution of a Directorate possessing the confidence of the Chamber.

As regards the paragraph of the report reminding the Council of the power conferred on the signatories of the Memel Convention, which the German representative had appealed to them to exercise, Lord Londonderry said

that he would communicate the appeal to his Government.

The representatives of Italy, Japan, and France, also signatories of the Memel Convention, associated themselves with the observations and suggestions of the British representative.

The conclusions of the report were then adopted, the reservations of the Lithuanian representative being recorded in the minutes.

3. THE LIBERIAN REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE.

The Committee of the Council appointed to consider the request of Liberia for certain forms of social, financial, and administrative assistance, met in Geneva under the presidency of Viscount Cecil from January 25th to February 4th.*

The Committee had before it the report of the experts instructed to make a special study of the problem on the spot. Owing to the fact that this report had not been received in Monrovia in time for the Liberian Government and legislature to examine it for this meeting, it was decided that no definitive report to the Council should be made before its next session. The Committee of the Council, however, availed itself of the presence in Geneva of the experts, M. Brunot, M. Lighthart, and Dr. Mackenzie, to obtain supplementary information and explanations based on the report so as to enable it to advise the Council as to conditions upon which assistance might be granted to Liberia.

The Committee of the Council, with the help of the experts, considered the existing political, administrative, and health conditions, as well as the economic and financial situation prevailing in Liberia. It also had the benefit of the views of Mr. Grimes, Secretary of State of Liberia, on these questions.

The programme of assistance recommended by the experts provides for measures to abolish slavery and forced labour in fact as well as in law, and for the future development of that territory in the economic, intellectual, and moral spheres. This programme envisages among its first essentials, an improved system of communications and education. It suggests certain changes in the administrative divisions of the territory, as well as certain changes in the powers exercised by heads of districts and by the provincial commissioners.

* The Committee was constituted as follows: Viscount Cecil (Great Britain), M. de St. Quentin (France), M. von Weizsäcker (Germany), M. Rosso (Italy), M. de Madariaga (Spain), M. Zaleski (Poland), M. Garay (Panama), M. Grimes (Liberia).

The report also recommends the appointment of a limited number of foreign advisers, particularly in regard to financial, legal, military, and health matters.

In the course of its examination, the Committee also considered the nature of the loan contract between the Liberian Government and the Foreign Finance Corporation of America, as well as the relation of the Firestone Plantations Company to the programme of Liberian development. It was noted that, according to the terms of the loan contract, no funds can become available for the suggested programme unless (a) the total customs receipts of Liberia reach a figure not immediately realisable under present conditions, or (b) the terms of the loan contract are altered whereby the second half of the five million dollar loan, or a portion of it, may be made available. Liberian borrowings from other sources are excluded for a given period of time under the terms of its loan contract of 1925.

The co-existence in Liberia of a comparatively weak state and a powerful foreign undertaking was considered by certain members of the Committee to give rise to certain disadvantages unless the undertaking were properly adjusted to the social and economic resources of the country.

The Committee understood that the Finance Corporation was disposed to give careful and sympathetic consideration to proposals of reconstruction and loan adjustment provided that the general plan of the League experts were made the basis of a definite scheme. It also understood that the Plantation Company was always prepared to give the utmost consideration to the general interests of Liberia.

In these circumstances, the Committee thought it advisable for the League to assist Liberia in the eventual financial negotiations by placing at its disposal the services of the League's Financial Committee. Similarly it appeared desirable for the Health Committee to help the Liberian Government in connection with the health measures envisaged.

As at its previous sittings, the Committee was assisted by Mr. Samuel J. Reber, representative of the United States Government, who expressed the hope of that Government that a practical reform scheme might be promptly established.

With a view to a definitive report at its next session, the Liberian representative stated that his Government would send its suggestions in regard to the report and the plan of assistance in ample time for communication to the members of the Committee before the next session.

On February 6th this question was dealt with by the Council, which considered the report of the Special Committee.

Mr. Grimes (Liberia) recalled that the plan of the experts apparently envisaged a scheme of reconstruction which would violate the constitution of the country in several vital respects. He referred to the assurance given by the Council in 1931 that the Members had never had any idea of infringing the independence of a State Member of the League, *i.e.*, the unrestricted exercise of its sovereign powers. The report of the experts would be carefully examined by the Liberian Government in the light of the above assurance.

Lord Cecil (British Empire) observed that the Liberian representative had very rightly spoken of the importance of doing nothing to infringe Liberia's independence. He wished, however, to explain that the League had been asked to assist Liberia to carry out the general principles, at any rate, of the reforms indicated in the report of the International Commission of Inquiry. It would be for the League and its Council to consider, after hearing the Liberian Government's observations, on what terms it would be possible for them to enter upon this very serious and responsible task. The Council and the League were entirely free to accept or reject that responsibility.

Lord Cecil also drew attention to the fact that it had been stated that witnesses who had given evidence before the International Commission of Inquiry had subsequently suffered persecution in Liberia. This had been denied by the Liberian Government, and it had not been within the Committee's power to investigate the matter further, but it had considered that the Council should bear this in mind when considering its action later.

The Liberian representative, Mr. Grimes, said that no reprisals had been taken against any witnesses who had testified before the International Commission, and that the allegations in question were the result of a political campaign. The present President of Liberia had made a complete change of government, and had seen fit to employ in the public service some of the persons who had testified before the Commission.

The Spanish representative, M. de Madariaga, said that in his opinion the report of the Commission of Inquiry had obviously been prepared by men of undoubted honesty and goodwill, but it showed a lack of perspective and, for that reason, was to some extent wanting in objectivity. Now that the question of the assistance to be given Liberia was coming within the League's sphere of activity, the latter could not

lose sight of the central difficulty with which that country was contending. The co-existence in Liberia of a weak republic and of an important commercial undertaking was the source of the trouble or, at any rate, one of its most important elements, as had been stated by the experts. Everyone agreed that Liberia could only escape from her present situation by issuing a loan, but the situation was such that a loan could only be issued with the help of the firm whose existence in Liberia at present constituted one of the principal difficulties of the country. The speaker considered that, when taking action with regard to Liberia, the League should lay down the essential principle that the firm should adapt itself to Liberia and not Liberia to the firm.

The Polish representative, M. Zaleski, was of opinion that the Council could not for the moment adopt a final resolution concerning arrangements with regard to Liberia.

M. Garay (Panama) said that he had not formed any final opinion as to the nature or the scope of the assistance which Liberia expected from the League. Was she aiming exclusively in her request for assistance at abolishing slavery and forced labour? Or was the League's assistance to be on wider lines? Was it suggested that the country should be opened up to foreign immigration, foreign capital, or foreign enterprise? These points, in particular, must be settled first.

Personally, M. Garay considered that the Liberian Treasury would perhaps be able to defray the cost of an anti-slavery campaign, but he expressed some doubt as to whether it could bear the cost of a wider campaign comprising, for instance, improvement of health conditions, financial reconstruction, adminis-

trative and, possibly, judicial conditions. He thought that it would be better to limit the efforts of Liberia to purely anti-slavery purposes.

The Liberian representative had expressed the very legitimate desire that the Liberian people should be given an opportunity to prove that they were self-sufficient; they intended to refrain from summoning foreign help except in so far as there were not in the country persons of native birth sufficiently trained to carry out the necessary reforms unaided.

M. Sottile (Liberia) said that his Government would gratefully welcome any of the League's decisions that did not overstep promises made as to the maintenance of the sovereign powers of the state and the exercise of those powers. He had serious doubts whether his Government could accept the report of the Special Committee, as it exceeded the competence of the experts and was in contradiction with the terms made regarding the independence and the sovereign powers of the State.

Replying to the Panama representative, M. Sottile pointed out that slavery and forced labour had been abolished in Liberia more than a year ago. The situation in his country was identical with that which might be found to exist in other parts of Africa, where, although slavery had been abolished, isolated cases still existed.

At the request of the Liberian Government, the Council decided to postpone to its next session the examination and discussion of the report submitted by the experts who visited Liberia last summer, this report having been received by the Liberian Government only towards the middle of November, 1931.

VII.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

March 15th.—Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, Paris.

March 30th.—Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment, Paris.

March 30th.—Governing Body and Directors' Committee of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Paris.

April 4th.—Traffic in Women and Children Committee, Geneva.

April 9th.—Child Welfare Committee, Geneva.

April 14th.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Automobiles, Geneva.

April 15th.—Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, Geneva.

April 18th.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Timber, Geneva.

April 21st.—Economic Committee, Geneva.

April 25th.—Financial Committee, Geneva.

April 25th.—Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

May 4th.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

May 12th.—Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, Frankfurt-on-Main.

June 6th.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

July 12th.—Delegation of Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth, Geneva.

July 15th.—Executive and Directors' Committee of the International Organisation of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

July 18th.—Fourteenth plenary session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

1. SESSIONS OF THE COURT.

On February 4th, 1932, the Twenty-third (Extraordinary) Session of the Court, which had been opened on November 5th, 1931, was declared closed.

The Twenty-fourth (Ordinary) Session of the Court opened on February 1st, 1932. The Court was composed on this occasion of all the regular judges—excepting Mr. Kellogg (United States of America), M. de Bustamante (Cuba), and M. Negulesco (Roumania), who were unable, for reasons of health, to come to The Hague—namely, M. Adatci (President, Japan), M. Guerrero (Vice-President, Salvador), Baron Rolin-Jaequemyns (Belgium), Count Rostworowski (Poland), M. Fromageot (France), M. Altamira (Spain), M. Anzilotti (Italy), M. Urrutia (Colombia), Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain), M. Schücking (Germany), Jonkheer van Eysinga (Netherlands), and M. Wang (China). The Session list included the case, submitted to the Court for an advisory opinion, relating to the interpretation of the Agreement concluded at Geneva on December 9th, 1927, between Bulgaria and Greece, and known as the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement.

2. THE CASE CONCERNING THE TREATMENT OF POLISH NATIONALS AT DANZIG.

On February 4th, 1932, the Court delivered the Advisory Opinion for which it had been asked by the Council of the League on the following point:

"1. Is the question of the treatment of Polish nationals and other persons of Polish origin or speech in the territory of the Free City of Danzig to be decided solely by reference to Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles and Article 33, paragraph 1, of the Convention of Paris (and any other treaty provisions in force which may be applicable), or also by reference to the Constitution of the Free City; and is the Polish Government accordingly entitled to submit to the organs of the League of Nations, by the method provided for in Article 103 of the Treaty of Versailles and Article 30 of the Convention of Paris, disputes concerning the application to the above-mentioned

persons of the provisions of the Danzig Constitution and other laws of Danzig?

"2. What is the exact interpretation of Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles and of Article 33, paragraph 1, of the Convention of Paris, and, if the reply to question (1) is in the affirmative, of the relevant provisions of the Constitution of the Free City?"

The Court's reply to the first of these questions is in the negative. In answer to the second, it explains its interpretation of Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles and of Article 33 (1) of the Convention of Paris in detail; this interpretation differs from both of those suggested by the two interested Governments, but is nearer to the view of the Free City.

The Opinion as a whole was adopted by nine votes to four. It appears, however, from the dissenting opinion signed by the minority (MM. Guerrero, Rostworowski, Fromageot, Urrutia) that the Court unanimously approved the reply to the first question, and that the divergence of views was confined to the second. Two of the judges voting with the majority (Baron Rolin-Jaequemyns and Sir Cecil Hurst) filed a separate statement of reasons. The Court, in its opinion, after briefly summarising the difficulties which led up to the reference of the matter to the Court, and shortly to explaining the origin of the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig and of Article 33 of the Convention of Paris, the interpretation of which was the main point at issue proceeds to consider the questions asked.

First Question.

The Court in the first place considers whether the two parts of which this question consists constitute in reality two distinct questions. It comes to the conclusion that they do not; in its view, they are to be regarded as constituting only one question, namely, whether the Polish Government is entitled to resort to the procedure provided for in Article 103 of the Treaty of Versailles and Article 39 of the Convention of Paris—i.e., to the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations at Danzig—in disputes concerning the application to Polish nationals, etc., of the laws

* This Chapter has been prepared with the aid of information furnished by the Registry.

of Danzig and, in particular, of the Constitution of the Free City.

In regard to this question, the Court first observes that the League has the right to intervene in the event of an improper application by Danzig of her Constitution. But it also observes that such intervention is not the same thing as the procedure provided for by the articles above-mentioned.

With regard to this procedure, the Court shows that the Constitution of Danzig is not among the instruments in regard to the application of which Article 103 of the Treaty of Versailles gives jurisdiction to the High Commissioner. Similarly, the Court shows that a dispute concerning the application of the Danzig Constitution to Polish nationals, etc., does not fulfil the conditions upon which the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner, as defined by Article 39 of the Convention of Paris, is made to depend. In this connection the Court says that "the general principles of international law apply to Danzig subject, however, to the treaty provisions binding upon the Free City," and that "the peculiar character of the Danzig Constitution affects only the relations between Danzig and the League." But the Court adds that the application of the Danzig Constitution may result in the breach of an international obligation incumbent on Danzig towards Poland and that, in such case, Poland may resort to the international procedure provided for in Article 39.

Second Question.

Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles.—On the basis of the circumstances attendant on the establishment of the Free City, the Court declares that Article 104 of the Treaty of Versailles contains a mandate given to the Principal Powers to negotiate a convention between Poland and Danzig, designed to fulfil certain objects specified in the Treaty, which Convention was to secure to Poland the advantages guaranteed her by the Treaty.

The object of paragraph 5 of Article 104 is to prevent any discrimination to the detriment of Polish nationals, etc. The Court considers that the clause is intended to prohibit any discrimination on the ground of the Polish character of the persons in question, and it observes that the provision, which is purely negative, in that it is confined to a prohibition of any discrimination, is silent on the question between whom no discrimination is to be made: accordingly it affords no standard of comparison. The Court, observing that in this connection the question had been raised whether the Articles of the Treaty of Versailles

concerning Danzig had become binding on the Free City, says that the contents of Article 104 (5) of the Treaty have undoubtedly become a rule of law binding on the Free City in relation to Poland, but only because they have been reproduced in the Convention of Paris. Moreover, this provision is only enforceable in respect of Danzig in that it is an authentic expression of the mandate conferred on the Principal Powers. From the point of view of relations between Danzig and Poland, the Convention of Paris is the instrument directly binding upon the Free City; the Treaty of Versailles may, however, be invoked, if need be, in order to elucidate the meaning of the Convention.

Proceeding next to the interpretation of Article 33 of the Convention, the Court, on the basis of an analysis of the circumstances in which that article had its origin, observes that, at the outset, the article was confined to granting to Polish nationals, etc., the system of minority protection, and that this system was regarded as fulfilling the object aimed at by Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles. Do the modifications subsequently made in the Convention—more particularly the insertion of the actual terms of Article 104 (5) of the Treaty of Versailles in Article 33 of the Convention—alter this situation? Poland thinks that they do. Danzig takes the opposite view: according to the Polish Government, this article now grants Polish nationals, etc., national treatment; according to the Danzig Government, it still means the minority system only.

The Court takes neither of these views. In its opinion, Danzig, by accepting the article in question, has assumed two undertakings: to apply to minorities in her territory (including foreigners fulfilling the requisite conditions as regards origin, race, language, or religion) the system laid down for minorities in Poland; and also to prevent any discrimination to the detriment of Polish nationals, etc., by reason of their Polish character. The latter undertaking—which according to the Court is new—may be considered as a guarantee also to grant to Polish nationals, etc., any rights, more extensive than those ensuing from the minority system, which the Free City may accord to minorities or foreigners not belonging to a minority in her territory.

Finally the Court observes, on the one hand, that the minority system, as always, only represents the minimum guarantees imposed on the State concerned, which remains at liberty to grant more extensive rights, and, on the other hand, that the free and secure access to the sea guaranteed to Poland by provisions

of the Convention of Paris, other than Article 33, is irreconcilable with a system under which the territory of Danzig would be closed to Poles.

3. CASE CONCERNING THE CAPHANDARIS-MOLLOTT AGREEMENT OF DECEMBER 9TH, 1927.

The Greek Government, availing itself of its right under Article 31 of the Statute and Article 71 of the Rules of Court, appointed M. Megalos Caloyanni to sit as judge *ad hoc* of the Court on the above case.

M. Caloyanni, former Councillor of the High Court of Appeal at Cairo, has already sat as a judge *ad hoc* of the Court in several previous cases.

The Greek Government further appointed M. N. Politis, Greek Minister at Paris, as Counsel in the case. The Bulgarian and Greek Governments each filed a second written statement on February 8th.

The hearings were opened on February 12th when M. Papazoff and M. Caloyanni, the judges *ad hoc*, appointed by the Bulgarian and Greek Governments respectively, made the solemn declaration prescribed by Article 20 of the Statute, and by Article 5 of the Rules of Court, and were declared duly installed as judges *ad hoc* in the case.

At the hearings held on February 12th and 13th, the Court heard the oral arguments presented by M. Théodoroff, on behalf of the Bulgarian Government, and by M. Politis on behalf of the Greek Government.

On February 13th the President declared the hearings closed, while reserving the right of the Court to ask for any supplementary information which it might require.

The Court then commenced its deliberations on the case.

ANNEX I.

Organisations and Commissions of the League of Nations.¹

A. — THE ASSEMBLY.

(Constituted under the Covenant of the League of Nations (Articles 2 and 3) ; consists of not more than three representatives of each State Member.)

B. — THE COUNCIL.

(Constituted under the Covenant of the League of Nations (Articles 2 and 4) ; consists of the representatives of the British Empire, France, Germany, Italy and Japan, who are permanent Members, and those of nine other States elected by the Assembly.²)

Membership in 1931-32.

British Empire	Japan
China	Norway
France	Panama
Germany	Peru
Guatemala	Poland
Irish Free State	Spain
Italy	Yugoslavia

C. — THE SECRETARIAT.

(Constituted under the Covenant of the League of Nations (Articles 2 and 6) ; consists of " a Secretary-General and such secretaries and staff as may be required ".)

Secretary-General : Sir Eric DRUMMOND.

D. — COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND COMMISSIONERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

I.—REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

I. THE PERMANENT ADVISORY COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NAVAL AND AIR QUESTIONS.

(Constituted under Article 9 of the Covenant. The members are appointed by and are representatives of the Governments of the States represented on the Council.)

Members and Assistants.

British Empire	Brigadier A. C. TEMPERLEY. Major DREW. Vice-Admiral A.D.P.R. POUND. Commander G. D. BELBEN. Colonel (Group Captain) J. T. BABINGTON.	Japan	Captain P. MARONI. Commander L. DARETTI. Brig.-General A. PELLEGRINI. Brigadier-General H. TANI. Lieutenant-Colonel OTA. Captain SHIMIZU. Captain Y. Ko.
China	—		Lieut.-Commander S. TOMIOKA. Lieutenant K. TOIBANA.
France	Brigadier-General RÉQUIN. Lieutenant-Colonel LUCIEN. Captain E. DELEUZE. Colonel H. E. MOUCHARD.	Norway	Commandant W. STEFFENS. Captain Edgar OTTO.
Germany	Colonel SCHOENHEINZ. Colonel KARMANN. Vice-Admiral Baron VON FREYBERG ALLMENDINGEN EISENBERG. Lieut.-Commander ERNST. Commandant REINECKE. Major TSCHUNKE.	Panama.	—
		Peru	—
		Poland	Brig.-General T. KASPRZYCKI. Colonel S. KUNSTLER. Captain A. PONCET DE SANDON. Commander E. SOLSKI. Colonel JANUSZ DE BEAURAIN.
Guatemala	—	Spain	General J. G. BENITEZ. Vice-Admiral J. MONTAGUT Y MIRO.
Irish Free State	Commandant D. BRYAN.		Colonel S. GARCIA DE PRUNEDA
Italy	General Commanding an Army Corps Alberto DE MARINIS STENDARDO DI RICIGLIANO. Lieut.-Colonel E. GIGLIOLI.	Yugoslavia	Brig.-Gen. M. NENADOVITCH. Captain V. MARIYACHEVITCH.

¹ For the International Labour Organisation, see the publications of the International Labour Office.

² See *Monthly Summary*, 1926, Vol. VI, No. 9, page 232, rules for the election of the nine non-permanent Members of the Council.

2. SPECIAL COMMISSION FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

Count BERNSTORFF (*Chairman*).

Belgium . . .	Baron MONCHEUR.	Japan	M. Naotake SATO.
British Empire	The Hon. Alexander CADOGAN.	Netherlands . . .	M. V. H. RUTGERS.
Canada . . .	Dr. W. A. RIDDELL.	Norway	M. Eric COLBAN.
Chile	—	Panama	—
China	Dr. Woo KAISENG.	Peru	M. BARRETO.
Colombia . . .	M. German ABADIA.	Persia	Colonel Ali Khan RIAZI.
Cuba	M. Guillermo DE BLANCK.	Poland	M. F. SOKAL.
Czechoslovakia	M. Z. FIERLINGER.	Roumania	M. Constantin ANTONIADE.
Finland . . .	M. R. HOLSTI.	Salvador	M. J. G. GUERRERO.
France	M. René MASSIGLI.	Spain	M. E. COBIÁN.
Germany . . .	M. FROHWEIN.	United States . .	The Hon. Hugh WILSON.
Guatemala . .	Dr. José MATOS.	Venezuela	Dr. C. PARRA-PÉREZ.
Irish Free State	Mr. Sean LESTER.	Yugoslavia	Dr. J. CHOUMENKOVITCH.
Italy	General Commanding an Army Corps Alberto DE MARINIS STENDARDO DI RICIGLIANO.		

3. CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMISSIONS OF INVESTIGATION.

(Appointed by the Council under the regulations concerning the exercise of its right of investigation.)

Commission of Investigation in Germany :
General BARATIER.

Commission of Investigation in Austria :
General CALCAGNO.

Commission of Investigation in Bulgaria :
General SCHUURMAN.

Commission of Investigation in Hungary :
General LYNDEN-BELL.

II.—COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY FOR EUROPEAN UNION.

(*List of Members at the Fourth and Fifth Sessions.*)

President : M. Giuseppe MOTTA, Head of the Political Federal Department (Switzerland).

Albania : M. Lec KURTI, Resident Minister, Permanent Delegate accredited to the League of Nations.

Austria : Dr. Johannes SCHÖBER, Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Belgium : M. Paul HYMANS, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

British Empire : Viscount CECIL of CHELWOOD.

Bulgaria : M. Vladimir MOLLOFF, Deputy, former Finance Minister.

Czechoslovakia : M. Eduard BENES, Minister for Foreign Affairs. Dr. Kamil KROFTA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

Denmark : Dr. Peter MUNCH, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Estonia : M. Jean TÕNNISSON, Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Ch. R. PUSTA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Paris.

Finland : Baron YRJÖ-KOSKINEN, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

France : M. Pierre FLANDIN, Finance Minister.

Germany : Dr. Julius CURTIUS, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Greece : M. André MICHALAKOPOULOS, Vice-President of the Council of Ministers.

Hungary : M. Louis WALKO, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Irish Free State : Hon. Patrick MCGILLIGAN, Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Sean LESTER, Permanent Delegate accredited to the League of Nations.

Italy : M. Dino GRANDI, Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Bonifacio CIANCARELLI, Minister Plenipotentiary.

Latvia : M. Karlis ULMANIS, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.

Lithuania : Dr. Dovas ZAUNIUS, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Luxemburg : M. Joseph BECH, Minister of State, Prime Minister, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Netherlands : Jonkheer F. BEELAERTS VAN BLOKLAND, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Norway : M. Birger BRAADLAND, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Poland : M. Auguste ZALESKI, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Portugal : Dr. Augusto DE VASCONCELLOS, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate accredited to the League of Nations, former Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Roumania : M. Nicolas TITULESCO, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in London, former Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Spain : M. Alejandro LERROUX, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Sweden : Baron S. G. F. T. RAMEL, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Switzerland : M. Giuseppe MOTTA.

Yugoslavia : Dr. Voislav MARINKOVITCH, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Governments Invited.

Free City of Danzig : M. Auguste ZALESKI, Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs. Dr. Arthur GRUNSPAN.
Iceland : M. Sveinn BJOERNSSON, Minister at Copenhagen.
Turkey : Dr. TEVFIK RUSTU Bey, Minister for Foreign Affairs.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics : M. Maxime LITVINOFF, People's Commissioner for Foreign Affairs.

Observers.

Canada : Dr. RIDDELL, Advisory Officer accredited to the League of Nations.
Japan : M. Nobumi ITO, Assistant Director of the Japanese Bureau for the League of Nations.

III. — THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.¹

I. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

(Constituted by the First Assembly in 1920 ; reorganised on a permanent basis by the Third Assembly in 1922 ; ten of the members of the Health Committee are nominated by the Committee of the *Office international d'Hygiène publique*, and six members are appointed by the Council. The Council may appoint assessors who rank as members.)

A. The Health Committee.

Dr. Th. MADSEN, Director of the State Serum Institute, Copenhagen (Danish) (*Chairman*).
M. O. VELGHE, Honorary Secretary-General of the Ministry of the Interior and of Health, Brussels ; President of the Comité permanent de l'*Office international d'Hygiène publique* (Belgian) (*Vice-Chairman ex-officio*).
Professor Léon BERNARD, President of the *Conseil supérieur d'Hygiène de France* (French) (*Vice-Chairman in 1932*).
Dr. C. HAMEL, President of the *Reichsgesundheitsamt*, Berlin (German) (*Vice-Chairman in 1932*).
Dr. M. TSURUMI, Representative of the Central Sanitary Bureau at the *Bureau du Japon*, Paris (Japanese) (*Vice-Chairman in 1932*).
Dame Janet CAMPBELL, Senior Medical Officer, of the British Health Ministry (British).
Professor J. CANTACUZÈNE, Minister of Labour, Health and Social Services, Professor of Bacteriology and Director of the Institute of Experimental Medicine, Bucharest (Roumanian).
Dr. J. HENG LIU, head of the National Health Administration at Nanking (Chinese).
Professor G. BASTIANELLI, Director of the *Ecole supérieure de Malariologie*, Rome (Italian).
Professor Jules BORDET, Director of the Pasteur Institute for Brabant, Brussels, holder of the Nobel Prize (Belgian).
Sir George BUCHANAN, Senior Medical Officer of the British Health Ministry (British).
Dr. H. CARRIÈRE, Director of the Swiss Public Health Service (Swiss).
Dr. Carlos CHAGAS, Director of the Oswaldo Cruz Institute at Rio de Janeiro (Brazilian).
Dr. W. CHODZKO, former Polish Health Minister, Director of the State School of Health, Warsaw (Polish).
Surgeon-General H. S. CUMMING, Director-General of the United States Public Health Service (American).
Professor J. G. FITZGERALD, Professor of Preventive Medicine and Director of the School of Public Health of the University of Toronto, Director of the Connaught Laboratories, Toronto (Canadian).
General J. D. GRAHAM, Indian Medical Service, Public Health Commissioner with the Government of India (British).
Dr. HUSSAMETTIN Bey, Under-Secretary of State at the Ministry of Health and Social Services at Ankara (Turkish).
Professor J. JADASSOHN, former Director of the Dermatological Clinic of Breslau University (German).
Dr. N. M. J. JIITA, Chairman of the Public Health Council of the Netherlands (Dutch).
Professor Ricardo JORGE, Technical Chairman of the *Conseil supérieur d'Hygiène*, Lisbon (Portuguese).
General LASNET, Inspector-General of the Colonial Health Service, Colonial Ministry, Paris (French).
Dr. A. LUTRARIO, former Director-General of Public Health, Ministry of the Interior, Rome (Italian).
Professor G. PITTALUGA, Professor of Parasitology at Madrid University and Director of the School of Hygiene (Spanish).
Professor José SCOSERIA, former Chairman of the *Conseil supérieur d'Hygiène*, Montevideo (Uruguayan).
Dr. A. STAMPAR, former General Inspector of the Health Services at the Ministry of Social Welfare and Public Health, Belgrade (Yugoslav).

In view of the difficulty experienced by Japanese experts in coming frequently to Geneva, one of the three following experts will be invited to attend each Session of the Committee :

Professor NAGAYO, Director of the Government Institute for Infectious Diseases at the Imperial University, Tokio (Japanese).
Professor MIYAJIMA, Professor at the Kitasato Institute, Tokio (Japanese).
Dr. HATA, Professor at the Kitasato Institute, Tokio (Japanese).

B. Committees in Relation with the Health Committee.(a) *Malaria Commission.*

Dr. A. LUTRARIO (*Chairman*).
Professor J. CANTACUZÈNE.
Dr. C. CHAGAS.
General J. D. GRAHAM.
Professor Ricardo JORGE.
Professor G. PITTALUGA.

¹ Where not otherwise indicated, members of the Committees of the Technical Organisations sit in an individual capacity.

Corresponding Members and Experts :

Dr. ANIGSTEIN, State Health Institute, Warsaw.
 Dr. BAILEY, Rockefeller Foundation.
 Dr. M. BALFOUR, Health Centre, Athens.
 Dr. A. BARBER, Rockefeller Foundation, Lagos (Nigeria).
 Dr. C. A. BENTLEY, Director of Public Health, Calcutta.
 M. BONAMICO, Chief of the Bureau of Civil Engineers, Rome.
 Dr. F. BOYD, International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation.
 Professor BRUMPT, Faculty of Medicine, Paris.
 Dr. SADI DE BUEN, Central Malaria Commission, Madrid.
 Lieut.-Colonel S. R. CHRISTOPHERS, Central Research Institute, Kasauli (India).
 Dr. R. K. COLLINS, Rockefeller Foundation, Ministry of Health, Sofia.
 Major G. COVELL, Assistant Director, Malaria Survey, Kasauli (India).
 Mr. T. D. EVANS, Assistant Director, Public Works Department, Nigeria.
 Dr. FERREL, Rockefeller Foundation.
 Dr. R. GREEN, Medical Research Institute, Kuala Lumpur (Fed. Malay States).
 Dr. W. C. HACKETT, Rockefeller Foundation, Experimental Station for Anti-Malaria Work, Rome.
 Colonel S. P. JAMES, Ministry of Health, London.
 Dr. I. J. KLIGLER, Health Department, Jewish University, Jerusalem.
 Professor Makoto KOIDZUMI, Faculty of Medicine of Keio University, Japan.
 Dr. A. LABRANCA, of the Italian Public Health Service.
 Professor MARCHOUX, Pasteur Institute, Paris.
 Professor E. MARCINOVSKY, Director of the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Moscow.
 Dr. K. MARKOFF, Inspector of Malaria attached to the Bulgarian Public Health Service.
 Dr. K. F. MAXCY, United States Public Health Service.
 Dr. A. MISSIROLI, Director of the Experimental Station for Anti-Malaria Work, Rome.
 Professor MOLOFF, Faculty of Medicine, Sofia.
 Dr. C. MOUTOUSSI, Malaria Inspector, Athens.
 Professor MUHLENS, Institute for Tropical Diseases, Hamburg.
 Professor B. NOCHT, former Director of the Institute for Tropical Diseases, Hamburg.
 Professor D. OTTOLENGHI, Royal University of Bologna.
 Dr. PELTIER, Health Service of the Colonial Troops, Marseilles.
 Sir Ronald ROSS, Director of the Ross Institute and Hospital for Tropical Diseases, London.
 Professor Claus SCHILLING, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin.
 Professor SCHUFFNER, Director of the Tropical Section of the Royal Colonial Institute, Amsterdam.
 Dr. SFARIC, Director of the Anti-Malaria Station, Trogir, Yugoslavia.
 Professor E. SERGENT, Pasteur Institute of Algeria.
 Major J. A. SINTON, Director, Malaria Survey of India, Kasauli.
 Dr. A. I. STANTON, Colonial Office, London.
 Professor N. H. SWELLENGREBEL, Institute of Tropical Hygiene, Amsterdam.
 Sir Malcolm WATSON, Ross Institute and Hospital for Tropical Diseases, London.
 Dr. C. M. WENYON, Director-in-Chief, Wellcome Bureau of Scientific Research, London.
 Dr. L. L. WILLIAMS, Chief of Anti-Malaria Section, U.S. Public Health Service.
 Dr. Senior WHITE, Chief Malariaologist, Bengal Nagpur Railway (India).
 Professor G. ZOTTA, Professor of Parasitology, Serological Institute, Bucharest.

*(b) Joint Commission of Experts on Public Health and Health Insurance.**Members nominated by the Health Committee of the League of Nations :*

Sir George NEWMAN, Chief Medical Officer at the British Ministry of Health (British) (*Chairman*).
 Dr. E. BELLENCONTRE, President of the *Association générale des Médecins de France* (French).
 Dr. A. FORAMITTI, Deputy Director of the Federal Public Health Service of Austria (Austrian).
 Dr. C. HAMEL.
 Professor T. KITASHIMA, Chairman of the Council of the Japanese Medical Association (Japanese).
 Dr. J. KUHN, Editor-in-Chief of the *Ugeskrift for Læger* (Danish).

Members nominated by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office :

Dr. A. GRIESER, Director in the Ministry of Labour (German).
 M. A. JAUNIAUX, Senator, Secretary-General of the *Union nationale des Fédérations de mutualité socialistes* (Belgian).
 M. L. OLIVIER, Member of the Executive Committee of the *Fédération nationale de la mutualité*, Paris (French).
 M. K. OSTOWSKI, Director of the Central Union of Health Insurance Funds, Warsaw (Polish).
 Mr. E. PORTS, Honorary Secretary of the National Association of Insurance Committees (British).
 Dr. L. WINTER, former Minister for Social Welfare; Vice-President of the Central Union of Health Insurance Funds of Czechoslovakia (Czechoslovak).

*And its Sub-Commissions :**(1) Sub-Commission for the Education of the Health Insured :*

Dr. C. HAMEL.
 M. L. OLIVIER.

(2) Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Venereal Disease :

Dr. E. BELLENCONTRE.
 Dr. A. GRIESER.

(3) Sub-Commission on the Protection of School-Children :

Dr. J. KUHN.
Mr. E. POTTS.

*(4) Sub-Commission on Preventive Medicine :**Experts appointed by the Health Organisation of the League of Nations :*

Dr. L. HEIJERMANS, Director of the Medical and Sanitary Service, Amsterdam (Netherlands) (Chairman).
Professor L. PARISOT, Professor of Hygiene at the Faculty of Medicine of Nancy (French).
Dr. G. SEIFFERT, Medical Adviser to the Ministry of the Interior, Secretary of the Bavarian Federation for the Development of Public Health (German).
Dr. A. STAMPAR, former Director of the Public Health Department of Yugoslavia (Yugoslav).
Dr. Bela JOHAN, Director of the State Institute of Hygiene, Budapest (Hungarian).

Experts appointed by the International Labour Office :

Dr. E. BRESKY, Chief Medical Officer to the Central Institute of Social Insurance (Czechoslovak).
Dr. R. BUREAU, Medical Adviser to the National Union of Federations of Social Insurance Societies of Belgium (Belgian).
Dr. W. DUNCAN, Divisional Medical Inspector (British).
Dr. Cesare GIANNINI, Chief Medical Officer to the National Social Insurance Fund (Italian).
Dr. H. KLUSZINSKI, Medical Adviser to the Central Union of Polish Health Insurance Funds (Polish).
Dr. Walter PRYLL, Chief Medical Officer to the Berlin Central Local Fund (German).

(5) Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Tuberculosis :

Dr. C. HAMEL.
Professor T. KITASHIMA.
M. A. JAUNIAUX.
M. O. OSIOWSKI.

(6) Sub-Commission on the Protection of Maternity, Infancy, and the Child of pre-School Age :

Dr. A. FORAMITTI.
Dr. L. WINTER.

(c) Permanent Commission on Standardisation of Serological and Biological Products.

Dr. Th. MADSEN (Chairman).
Professor Jules BORDET.
Professor H. H. DALE, Director of the Biochemical and Pharmacological Departments of the National Institute of Medical Research, London (British).
Professor W. KOLLE, Director of the Institute of Experimental Therapy, Frankfort-on-Main (German).
Professor Louis MARTIN, of the Pasteur Institute, Paris (French).
Dr. G. MCCOY, Director of the Hygienic Laboratory of the United States Public Health Service (American).
Professor LECLAINCHE, Director of the International Office of Animal Diseases, Paris (French).

(d) Commission of Experts for the Co-ordination of Sleeping-Sickness Research.

Dr. A. G. BAGSHAW, Professor at the London School of Tropical Medicine.
Professor E. VAN CAMPENHOUT, former Director of the Health Service of the Belgian Colonial Office.
Professor Aldo CASTELLANI, Director of Tropical Medicine and Dermatology, Ross Institute and Hospital for Tropical Diseases, London.
Professor Gustave MARTIN, School of Tropical Medicine, Marseilles.
Professor Damas MORA, Director of the Health Services of Angola.
Professor G. PITTALUGA.
Professor Richard STRONG, Department of Tropical Medicine, Harvard University Medical School.
Dr. Max TAUTE, General Medical Adviser, Ministry of the Interior, Berlin.

(e) Leprosy Commission.

Dr. Carlos CHAGAS (Chairman).
Surgeon-General H. S. CUMMING.
General J. D. GRAHAM.
Professor NAGAYO.
Professor B. NOCHT.
Dr. MITCHELL, Director of Public Health, Pretoria.
Professor E. MUIR, School of Tropical Medicine, Calcutta.
Sir Leonard ROGERS, London.
Dr. H. W. WADE, Medical Director of the L. Wood Memorial, Culion Leper Colony, Culion Palawan, Philippines.

(f) Opium Commission of the Health Organisation.

Dr. H. CARRIÈRE (Chairman).
Dr. W. CHODZKO.
Surgeon-General H. S. CUMMING.
Dr. C. HAMEL.
Dr. HENG LIU.

Professor Ricardo JORGE.
Dr. TSURUMI.
M. O. VELGHE.

Expert :

Professor E. VON KNATTI-LENZ, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Vienna (Austrian).

(g) *Commission on Ship Fumigation.*

Surgeon-General H. S. CUMMING (*Chairman*).
Sir George BUCHANAN.
General J. D. GRAHAM.
Dr. N. M. J. JITTA.
Professor B. NOCHT.
M. O. VELGHE.
Dr. W. DREYER, Port Doctor, Bremen.
Dr. Monier WILLIAMS, of the British Health Ministry.
Dr. C. L. WILLIAMS, U.S. Quarantine Station, Rosebank, Staten Island, N.Y.

Expert :

Dr. P. G. STOCK, of the British Health Ministry.

(h) *Sub-Commission for the Sanitary Reorganisation of Chinese Ports.*

Dr. A. LUTRARIO (*Chairman*).
Sir George BUCHANAN.
Surgeon-General H. S. CUMMING.
Dr. N. M. J. JITTA.
Professor MIYAJIMA.

(i) *Sub-Commission on the Improvement of Penal Administration.*

Dr. C. HAMEL (*Chairman*).
Professor LÉON BERNARD.
Dame Janet CAMPBELL.
Professor FITZGERALD.
Professor JADASSOHN.
Professor SCOSERIA.

Expert :

Dr. WOKER.

(j) *Group of Experts for the Study of Physical Education.*

Professor D. OTTOLENGHI, Bologna (*Chairman*).
Professor DURIG, Vienna.
Professor KNOLL, Hamburg.
Professor LOEWY, Davos.
Professor LINDHARD, Copenhagen.
Professor LILJESTRAND, Stockholm.
Professor PIASECKI, Poznan.
Senator VIOLA, Bologna).

Rapporteur :

Dr. SCHNELL.

(k) *Sub-Commission for the International School of Higher Health Studies.*

Professor LÉON BERNARD (*Chairman*).
Professor JULES BORDET.
Professor J. D. FITZGERALD.
Dame Janet CAMPBELL.
Dr. TH. MADSEN.
Professor PITTALUGA.

(l) *Committee of Experts on Syphilis and Similar Questions.*

Professor JADASSOHN (*Chairman*).
Dr. TH. MADSEN.
Colonel L. W. HARRISON, British Health Ministry (British).
Dr. L. QUEYRAT, President of the French National League against the Venereal Peril (French).
Dr. J. W. STOKES, Professor of Dermatology and Syphilology at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania (American).
Professor C. RASCH, Director of the State Hospital at Copenhagen (Danish).

Technical Secretary :

Dr. MARTENS-FIN, Director of the Dermatological Clinic at Friedrichstadt Hospital, Dresden (German).

(m) *Commission of Experts for Standardising the Methods of ascertaining the Morphine Content of Opium.*

Dr. VAN ITALLIE, Professor of Pharmacy and Toxicology at the University of Leyden (*Chairman*).
 Dr. H. Baggesgaard RASMUSSEN, Professor of Chemistry at the *Pharmaceutiske Lærenanstalt*, Copenhagen.
 Dr. EDER, Professor of Pharmacognosy and Pharmaceutical Chemistry at the Zurich Polytechnic.
 Dr. A. GORIS, Professor of Galenic Pharmacy at the *Faculté de Pharmacie*, Paris.
 Dr. von KNAFFL-LENZ, Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology at Vienna University.
 Dr. CARL MANNICK, Director of the *Pharmaceutisches Institut*, Berlin Dahlem.
 Professor JASUHIKO ASAHINA, Imperial University, Tokio.

(n) *Committee on Health Teaching.*

Professor LÉON BERNARD (*Chairman*).
 Dr. MADSEN.
 Professor CANTACUZÈNE.
 Dr. CHODZKO.
 Dr. HAMEL.
 Professor R. JORGE.
 Professor PITTALUGA.
 Dr. STAMPAR.

Corresponding Members and Experts :

Professor BEJARANO, Bogotá.
 Sir George NEWMAN, London.
 Dr. F. C. YEN, Shanghai.
 Professor PARISOT, Nancy.
 Professor WELCH, Baltimore.
 Professor JAMESON, London.

And Directors of Schools of Health :

Professor FITZGERALD, Toronto (*Chairman*).
 Professor LÉON BERNARD, Paris (*European Chairman*).
 Dr. JAMESON, London.
 Professor PITTALUGA, Madrid.
 Dr. N. WHITE, Athens.
 Dr. B. JOHAN, Budapest.
 Dr. CHODZKO, Warsaw.
 Dr. VÁCEK, Prague.
 Dr. MADSEN, Copenhagen.
 Professor PARISOT, Nancy.
 Dr. RASUHIN, Zagreb.
 Professor PRAUSNITZ, Breslau.

And Directors of Health Museums :

Dr. ROCEK, Brno.
 Dr. GAUD, Rabat.
 Dr. SEIRING, Dresden.
 Dr. DAUKES, London.
 Dr. NEWMAN, London.
 Dr. POLLERMANN, Budapest.
 Dr. J. BRAVO, Madrid.
 Dr. KACPRZAK, Warsaw.
 Dr. RASUHIN, Zagreb.
 Professor PRAUSNITZ, Breslau.

(o) *Committee on Medical Education.*

Dr. MADSEN (*Chairman*).
 Dr. C. HAMEL.
 Professor JADASSOHN.
 Professor TANDLER, Head of the Health and Municipal Assistance Department, Vienna.
 Professor GORTER, Director of the Pediatric Clinic at Leyden University.
 Professor ROUSSY, Laboratory of Pathological Anatomy, Paris.
 Professor R. DEBRÉ, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, Paris.
 Sir George NEWMAN, British Health Ministry, London.
 Dr. TAUTE, Adviser at the Ministry of the Interior, Berlin.
 Professor PRAUSNITZ, Director of the Health Institute, Breslau.

(p) *Sub-Committee for the Study of the Price of Radium.*

Dr. C. HAMEL (*Chairman*).
 Sir George BUCHANAN.
 Dr. JITTA.
 M. VELGHE.

(q) *Sub-Committee for the Study of the Budget and Report of the Eastern Bureau.*

Dr. N. M. J. JITTA (*Chairman*).
 Sir George BUCHANAN.
 Dr. HENG LIU.
 General GRAHAM.
 Professor MIYAJIMA.
 Dr. LUTRARIO.

C. *Reporting Committees.*(a) *Reporting Committee on Questions relating to Venereal Diseases.*

Professor JADASSOHN (*Chairman*).
 Dr. HARRISON, British Health Ministry (British).
 Professor GOUGEROT, Head of the Clinic for Skin Diseases of the Faculty of Medicine, Paris (French).
 Professor JESSNER, Director of the Dermatological Clinic at Breslau University (German).

Secretaries :

Dr. MÄRTENSTEIN, Dresden.
 Dr. MOERCH, Copenhagen.

(b) *Reporting Committee on Questions connected with the Anti-Tuberculosis Campaign.*

Professor LÉON BERNARD (*Chairman*).
 Dr. C. HAMEL.
 Professor McNALTY, British Health Ministry, London.
 Professor SOPER, Medical Director of the William Wirt Winchester Hospital, Professor at Yale University, New Haven, U.S.A.

(c) Reporting Committee for the Health of the Child of School Age and of the Adolescent.

Dr George BLCHAN, Medical Officer of Health, Willesden (British)

Professor ROHMER, Director of the Medical Clinic for Infants at the Strasburg Civilian Hospital (French)

Professor SCHLOSSMANN, Director of the Infant Clinic, Düsseldorf (German).

Professor SCHELEMA, Head of the Hospital for Sick Children at the University of Groningen (Netherlands)

Professor TANDLER, Municipal Head of the Health and Assistance Department, Vienna (Austrian)

Technical Secretary:

Madame Dr GREINER, Vienna.

(d) Reporting Committee on Maternal and Infant Welfare and the Health of the Child of pre-School Age.

Dame Janet CAMPBELL (*Chairman*).

Professor Robert DEBRÉ.

Professor GORTER

Professor ROTT, Director of the *Deutsche Vereinigung für Säuglings und Kleinkinderschutz*, Berlin

Professor GAMMELTOFT, Professor of Gynaecology at the Rigshospital, Copenhagen.

Technical Secretary for the Question of the Health of the Child of pre-School Age:

Dr WORINGER, Assistant at the Pediatric Clinic, Strasburg.

D. Advisory Council of the Eastern Bureau.

Netherlands East Indies Dr. J. J. VAN LONKHUYZEN (*Chairman for 1931*).

French Indo-China Dr. F. H. GUÉRIN.

British Colonies and Dependencies Dr A. L. HOOPS

British India Major-General J. D. GRAHAM

China Dr. S. C. YIN.

Japan Dr. M. KATSUMATA.

Japanese Colonies Dr. K. SHIMOJO

Siam Dr Phya BORIRAKSH VEJGAR (*Vice-Chairman for 1931*).

Observers:

Federated Malay States Dr. C. J. WILSON.

Hawaii Dr S. B. GRUBBS

Philippine Islands Dr. R. W. HART.

2. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(Established on the recommendation of the Brussels Financial Conference of 1920; except where otherwise indicated, the members of the Committee of this Organisation are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity)

A. The Economic Committee.

Dr Richard SCHÜLLER (*Chairman*), Director of the Economic Section in the Austrian Foreign Ministry (Austrian)

M. W. STUCKI (*Vice-Chairman*), Director of the Federal Economic Department (Swiss)

Sir Sydney CHAPMAN, Member of the Tariff Advisory Committee of Great Britain (British).

M. A. DI NOLA, Director-General of the *Istituto italiano di Credito fondiario* (Italian).

M. F. DOLEZAL, Under-Secretary of State in the Polish Ministry for Commerce and Industry (Polish).

Mr Lucius R. IASTMAN, ex-President of the Merchants' Association of New York (American)

M. P. ELBI L, Director of Commercial Agreements in the Ministry of Commerce (French).

M. N. ITO, Counsellor of Embassy, Assistant Director of the Japanese League of Nations Office (Japanese).

M. F. VAN LANGENHOFF, Secretary-General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Belgian).

Mr. H. A. F. LINDSAY, Indian Trade Commissioner in London (Indian).

M. V. LUNDVIK, Director of the Federation of Swedish Industries (Swedish).

M. I. PIPOUTKA, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Czechoslovak).

M. TODOROVIC, Professor of Political Economy at Belgrade University (Yugoslav).

Dr. E. TIEPDLINGBURG, Secretary of State in the German Economic Ministry (German).

An Argentine Member.

Corresponding Members:

M. J. A. BAFFOZA-CARNIERO, Commercial Attaché, Brazilian Embassy, London (Brazilian).

M. Flores DE LIMA, Professor of Political Economy at Madrid University (Spanish)

M. G. JAHN, General Director of the Central Statistical Office of Norway (Norwegian).

M. A. JENSEN, Chief of the Department of Statistics, Ministry of Finance (Danish).

M. Rafael MARTINEZ-MINOZA, Member of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences (Venezuelan).

M. Rolo'ph MICHAEL, Head of the Treaties Section at the Estonian Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Estonian).

M. W. MONTIF, Counsellor of Legation, Chief of Section in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Latvian).

Professor P. NICULESCU, Minister Plenipotentiary (Roumanian).

M. Alfred DE NICKL, Plenipotentiary Minister, Director-General of Commercial Agreements in the Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Hungarian).
 M. J. A. NEDERBRAGT, Director of Economic Affairs at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Netherlands).
 M. Raul SIMON, Chief of the Budget Committee of the Ministry of Finance, Santiago (Chilian).
 Mr. D. J. DE VILLIERS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary (South African).
 M. S. U. ZAU, Director of the Bureau of Industrial and Commercial Information of the Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Labour (Chinese).
 A Finnish Member.

B. The Consultative Committee of the Economic Organisation.

M. George THEUNIS, Minister of State (Belgian) (*Chairman*).
 Sir Atul Chandra CHATTERJEE, High Commissioner for India in London (Indian) (*Vice-Chairman*).
 M. COLIJN, former Prime Minister, former Minister of Finance (Netherlands) (*Vice-Chairman*).
 M. J. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, Commercial Attaché to the Brazilian Embassy in London (Brazilian).
 M. BENNI, Deputy, President of the Fascist General Industrial Federation (Italian).
 Professor Francisco BERNIS, Secretary-General of the National Banking Council (Spanish).
 M. CHUAN CHAO, Barrister (Chinese).
 M. J. CLAN, Plenipotentiary Minister, President of the Danish Commission for the Conclusion of Commercial Treaties (Danish).
 M. F. P. DA CUNHA LEAL, Engineer, Governor of the Bank of Angola, former Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Portuguese).
 Mme. Emmi FREUNDLICH, President of the International Guild of Co-operative Societies (Austrian).
 M. Jules GAUTIER, President of the National Federation of Agricultural Associations (French).
 M. Gustave L. GÉRARD, Director-General of the Central Industrial Committee of Belgium (Belgian).
 M. Hipolit GLIWIC, Senator, Vice-Marshal of the Senate, former Minister (Polish).
 Count HADIG, former Minister of Supplies, President of the Section for Economic Policy of the National Association of Agriculturists (Hungarian).
 Dr. A. HERMES, former Minister, Member of the International Agricultural Commission (German).
 Dr. F. HODAC, Professor of Political Economy, President of the Federation of Employers' Syndicates (Czechoslovak).
 M. E. JARAMILLO, Senator, Minister of Finance (Colombian).
 M. JOUHAUX, Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (French).
 M. N. KAWASHIMA, Minister at Athens, former Director of the Department of Commercial Treaties in the Foreign Ministry (Japanese).
 Dr. C. LAMMERS, Member of the Reichstag, Member of the Board of Directors of the *Reichsverband der deutschen Industrie* (German).
 Professor E. LAUR, Director of the Swiss Peasants' Union (Swiss).
 Sir Walter T. LAYTON, Editor of the *Economist* (British).
 Mr. F. L. McDougall (Australian).
 M. F. von MENDELSSOHN, President of the *Industrie-und Handelstag* (German).
 M. Aloys MEYER, Director-General of "L'Arbed" (Luxemburg).
 M. Hermann MÜLLER, Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (German).
 M. A. NASTA, Professor at the Agricultural College of Bucharest, Director-General at the Ministry of Agriculture and Domains (Roumanian).
 M. A. ORNE, Director-General of the Postal Service, former Minister of Communications (Swedish).
 M. OUDEGEEST, Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (Dutch).
 M. DE PEYERIMHOFF DE FONTENELLE, President of the *Comité des Houillères de France* (French).
 M. POPLAWSKI, former President of the Union of Agricultural Associations, former Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Finance (Polish).
 Sir Arthur PUGH, Vice-President of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, Secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation (British).
 Sir Walter RAINE, President of the Association of British Chambers of Commerce (British).
 M. Tomas RAMIREZ, former Minister of Education, Professor of Political Economy and Civil Law at Santiago University (Chilian).
 M. E. ROSSONI, Minister of State (Italian).
 M. SERRARENS, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Christian Syndicates (Netherlands).
 M. Vaino TANNER, former Prime Minister of Finland, Director-General of the Elanto Co-operative Society (Finnish).
 Mr. Alonzo E. TAYLOR, Director of Food Research Institute, Stanford University (American).
 Dr. Milan TODOROVITCH, Technical Adviser on Economic Questions in the Foreign Ministry (Yugoslav).
 M. J. TSUSHIMA, Financial Commissioner of the Japanese Government in London (Japanese).
 M. K. VARVARESSOS, Professor of Political Economy at Athens University (Greek).
 Two American Members.
 Another British Member.

Economic Committee :

Sir Sydney CHAPMAN.
 M. Gunnar JAHN.
 Dr. E. TRENDLENBURG.

Dr. Richard SCHÜLLER.
 M. P. ELBEL.

Financial Committee :

M. Albert JANSSEN.

International Institute of Agriculture (Rome) :

M. DE MICHELIS, President of the International Institute of Agriculture.

International Chamber of Commerce (Paris) :

M. PIRELLI, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Roland W. BOYDEN, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce.

M. E. HELDRING, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, Director of the *Konink. Nederlandsch. Stoomboot Maatschappij*.

International Commission of Agriculture (Paris) :

Marquis DE VOGÜÉ, President of the International Commission of Agriculture, Paris.

International Co-operative Alliance :

Mr. H. J. MAY, General Secretary of the International Co-operative Alliance.

*C. Committees in Relation with the Economic Committee.**(a) Committee of Experts on Customs Nomenclature.*

M. R. FIGHIERA (*Chairman*), Director of Commercial and Industrial Affairs, French Ministry of Commerce.

M. Paul COMTE, Inspector-General of Swiss Customs, General Direction of Customs.

M. Z. FAFL, Secretary of the Czechoslovak Chamber of Commerce.

M. I. FERENCZI, Ministerial Counsellor, Hungarian Ministry of Commerce.

M. H. FLACH, Adviser to the German Ministry of Commerce.

M. MAGNETTE, Inspector-General of Customs at the Belgian Ministry of Finance.

M. G. PACI, Bureau of Economic Studies of the Association of Stock Companies (Italy).

*(b) Agricultural Committee.**Delegation of the Economic Committee :*

Dr. Richard SCHÜLLER (Austrian).

Sir Sydney CHAPMAN (British).

M. F. DOLEZAL (Polish).

M. P. ELBEL (French).

M. N. ITO (Japanese).

Dr. E. TRENDLENBURG (German).

Agricultural Experts :

M. Carlos BREBBIA, Member of the Economic Agricultural Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture (Argentinian).

M. J. CANOVAS DEL CASTILLO, Secretary-General of the Association of Agriculturists, Madrid, Member of the National Assembly (Spanish).

Sir Atul CHATTERJEE, High Commissioner for India in London (Indian).

M. Einar COHN, Chief of Bureau, Statistical Department (Danish).

Mr. John COLBERT, President of the Agricultural Credit Corporation (Irish).

Dr. E. DOLLFUS, Director at the Chamber of Agriculture for Lower Austria (Austrian).

Mr. R. R. ENFIELD, Ministry of Agriculture (British).

M. Haakon FIVE, Prefect at Steinkjer (Norwegian).

M. Jules GAUTIER, President of Section at the *Conseil d'État* (French).

M. Bohumir HANOSK, Chief Councillor of Section at the Ministry of Agriculture (Czechoslovak).

Dr. A. HERMES, President of the Federation of German Peasants' Associations (German).

M. E. HYNINEN, Managing Director of the Central Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies (Finnish).

M. E. INSULANDER, Director-General of the Agricultural Administration (Swedish).

Professor E. LAUR, Director of the Swiss Peasants' Union (Swiss).

Mr. F. M. McDUGALL, Economic Adviser to the Commonwealth Government (Australian).

M. Aug. POPLAWSKI, Senator, President of the Land Bank, President of the Polish Agricultural Society (Polish).

M. JON RADUCANU, former Minister of Labour (Roumanian).

Dr. W. A. RIDDELL, Canadian Advisory Officer accredited to the League of Nations (Canadian).

Dr. J. J. L. VAN RIJN, Member of the Economic Agricultural Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture (Dutch).

M. Georg SCHMIDT, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Land Workers (German).

M. Arrigo SERFIERI, Professor of Rural Economy, Under Secretary of State at the Ministry of Agriculture (Italian).

Count Ladislas SOVSSICH, Member of the Upper Chamber, President of the Hungarian National Agricultural Society (Hungary).

Mr. Loyd V. STEFFE, Agricultural Commissioner, Berlin (American).

M. Velimir STOKOVITCH, Director of Agrarian Policy at the Ministry of Agriculture (Yugoslav).

M. Julien CORNEILLE VAN DER VALKEN, Director-General at the Ministry of Agriculture (Belgian).

M. K. ULMANIS, Deputy, former President of the Council (Latvian).

Delegation of the International Institute of Agriculture :

Professor A. BRIZI, Secretary-General of the International Institute of Agriculture.

M. RUIZ RUIZ, Delegate to the Permanent Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture.

D. The Financial Committee.

M. F. SUVICH (*Chairman*), Deputy Commissioner for Tourism, former Under-Secretary of State at the Ministry of Finance, Rome (Italian).
 Count DE CHALENDAR, Director-General of the *Compagnie d'assurances générales sur la vie* (French).
 Mr. Norman H. DAVIS, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Director of the Bank of New York and Trust Company (American).
 M. JANSSEN, former Minister of Finance (Belgian).
 M. KEMPNER, of Mendelssohn & Co., Berlin (German).
 M. C. E. TER MEULEN, Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).
 Dr. Feliks MLYNARSKI, Professor at the Higher Commercial School, former Vice-President of the Bank of Poland (Polish).
 Sir Otto NIEMEYER, Bank of England (British).
 Dr. V. POSPISIL, Governor of the Czechoslovak National Bank (Czechoslovak).
 M. RYGG, President of the Norwegian National Bank (Norwegian).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH, Chairman of the Union Corporation, Ltd., London (South African).
 M. T. TANAKA, Agent of the Bank of Japan in London (Japanese).
 M. Carlos A. TORNUST (Argentinian).

Gold Delegation.

M. Albert JANSSEN (*Chairman*) (Belgian).
 Professor M. J. BONN (German).
 Professor Gustav CASSEL (Swedish).
 Count DE CHALENDAR (French).
 M. Guido JUNG (Italian).
 Sir Reginald MANT (British).
 Dr. Feliks MLYNARSKI (Polish).
 Dr. Vilém POSPISIL (Czechoslovak).
 Mr. George E. ROBERTS (American).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH (South African).
 Dr. L. J. A. TRIP (Dutch).

*1. The Financial Reconstruction of Austria.**Trustees for the 1923 Loan.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. Albert JANSSEN, former Minister of Finance (Belgian).
 Mr. JAY, of Morgan & Co., Paris (American).
 Mr. Marcus WALLENBERG, Vice-President of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank (Swedish).

Agent of the Trustees at Vienna :

Austrian National Bank, Vienna.

Representative of the Financial Committee at Vienna :

M. M. B. ROST VAN TONNINGEN, of Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).

*2. The Financial Reconstruction of Hungary.**Trustees for the 1924 Loan.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

Cav. di Gr. Cr. Giuseppe BIANCHINI, President of the National Bankers' Federation (Italian).
 M. C. E. TER MEULEN, of Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH, Chairman of the Union Corporation, Ltd., London (South African).

Agent of the Trustees in Budapest :

Hungarian National Bank, Budapest.

Representative of the Financial Committee in Budapest :

Mr. Royall TYLER, of Hambro's Bank, Paris (American).

3. Adviser to the Bank of Greece.

Mr. H. C. F. FINLAYSON (British).

*4. Bulgaria.**(i) Settlement of Refugees.**(a) Honorary Commissioner of the League of Nations in Sofia.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. René CHARRON, of Lee, Higginson & Co., Paris (French).

(b) Trustees for the 1926 Loan.

(Appointed by the Council.)

Cav. di Gr. Cr. Giuseppe BIANCHINI, President of the National Bankers' Federation (Italian).
 Sir Herbert LAWRENCE (British).
 Mr. Marcus WALLENBERG, Vice-President of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank (Swedish).

International Chamber of Commerce (Paris) :

M. PIRELLI, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Roland W. BOYDEN, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce.

M. E. HELDRING, Member of the International Chamber of Commerce, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, Director of the *Konink. Nederlandsch. Stoomboot Maatschappij*.

International Commission of Agriculture (Paris) :

Marquis DE VOGÜÉ, President of the International Commission of Agriculture, Paris.

International Co-operative Alliance :

Mr. H. J. MAY, General Secretary of the International Co-operative Alliance.

*C. Committees in Relation with the Economic Committee.**(a) Committee of Experts on Customs Nomenclature.*

M. R. FIGHIERA (*Chairman*), Director of Commercial and Industrial Affairs, French Ministry of Commerce.

M. Paul COMTE, Inspector-General of Swiss Customs, General Direction of Customs.

M. Z. FAFL, Secretary of the Czechoslovak Chamber of Commerce.

M. I. FERENCZI, Ministerial Counsellor, Hungarian Ministry of Commerce.

M. H. FLACH, Adviser to the German Ministry of Commerce.

M. MAGNETTE, Inspector-General of Customs at the Belgian Ministry of Finance.

M. G. PACI, Bureau of Economic Studies of the Association of Stock Companies (Italy).

*(b) Agricultural Committee.**Delegation of the Economic Committee :*

Dr. Richard SCHÜLLER (Austrian).

Sir Sydney CHAPMAN (British).

M. F. DOLEZAL (Polish).

M. P. ELBEL (French).

M. N. ITO (Japanese).

Dr. E. TRENDLENBURG (German).

Agricultural Experts :

M. Carlos BREBBIA, Member of the Economic Agricultural Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture (Argentinian).

M. J. Canovas DEL CASTILLO, Secretary-General of the Association of Agriculturists, Madrid, Member of the National Assembly (Spanish).

Sir Atul CHATTERJEE, High Commissioner for India in London (Indian).

M. Einar COHN, Chief of Bureau, Statistical Department (Danish).

Mr. John COLBERT, President of the Agricultural Credit Corporation (Irish).

Dr. E. DOLLFUSS, Director at the Chamber of Agriculture for Lower Austria (Austrian).

Mr. R. R. ENFIELD, Ministry of Agriculture (British).

M. Haakon FIVE, Prefect at Steinkier (Norwegian).

M. Jules GAUTIER, President of Section at the *Conseil d'État* (French).

M. Bohumir HANOSEK, Chief Councillor of Section at the Ministry of Agriculture (Czechoslovak).

Dr. A. HERMES, President of the Federation of German Peasants' Associations (German).

M. E. HYNINEN, Managing Director of the Central Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies (Finnish).

M. E. INSULANDER, Director-General of the Agricultural Administration (Swedish).

Professor E. LAUR, Director of the Swiss Peasants' Union (Swiss).

Mr. F. M. McDUGALL, Economic Adviser to the Commonwealth Government (Australian).

M. Aug. POPLAWSKI, Senator, President of the Land Bank, President of the Polish Agricultural Society (Polish).

M. Ion RADUCANU, former Minister of Labour (Roumanian).

Dr. W. A. RIDDELL, Canadian Advisory Officer accredited to the League of Nations (Canadian).

Dr. J. J. L. VAN RIJN, Member of the Economic Agricultural Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture (Dutch).

M. Georg SCHMIDT, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Land Workers (German).

M. Arrigo SERPIERI, Professor of Rural Economy, Under Secretary of State at the Ministry of Agriculture (Italian).

Count Ladislav SOMSSICH, Member of the Upper Chamber, President of the Hungarian National Agricultural Society (Hungary).

Mr. Loyd V. STEERE, Agricultural Commissioner, Berlin (American).

M. Velimir STOKOVITCH, Director of Agrarian Policy at the Ministry of Agriculture (Yugoslav).

M. Julien CORNEILLE VAN DER VAEREN, Director-General at the Ministry of Agriculture (Belgian).

M. K. ULMANIS, Deputy, former President of the Council (Latvian).

Delegation of the International Institute of Agriculture :

Professor A. BRIZI, Secretary-General of the International Institute of Agriculture.

M. Rufo RUIRO, Delegate to the Permanent Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture.

D. The Financial Committee.

- M. F. SUVICH (*Chairman*), Deputy Commissioner for Tourism, former Under-Secretary of State at the Ministry of Finance, Rome (Italian).
 Count DE CHALENDAR, Director-General of the *Compagnie d'assurances générales sur la vie* (French).
 Mr. Norman H. DAVIS, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Director of the Bank of New York and Trust Company (American).
 M. JANSSEN, former Minister of Finance (Belgian).
 M. KEMPNER, of Mendelssohn & Co., Berlin (German).
 M. C. E. TER MEULEN, Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).
 Dr. Feliks MLYNARSKI, Professor at the Higher Commercial School, former Vice-President of the Bank of Poland (Polish).
 Sir Otto NIEMEYER, Bank of England (British).
 Dr. V. POSPISIL, Governor of the Czechoslovak National Bank (Czechoslovak).
 M. RYGG, President of the Norwegian National Bank (Norwegian).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH, Chairman of the Union Corporation, Ltd., London (South African).
 M. T. TANAKA, Agent of the Bank of Japan in London (Japanese).
 M. Carlos A. TORNUST (Argentinian).

Gold Delegation.

- M. Albert JANSSEN (*Chairman*) (Belgian).
 Professor M. J. BONN (German).
 Professor Gustav CASSEL (Swedish).
 Count DE CHALENDAR (French).
 M. Guido JUNG (Italian).
 Sir Reginald MANT (British).
 Dr. Feliks MLYNARSKI (Polish).
 Dr. Vilém POSPISIL (Czechoslovak).
 Mr. George E. ROBERTS (American).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH (South African).
 Dr. L. J. A. TRIF (Dutch).

*1. The Financial Reconstruction of Austria.**Trustees for the 1923 Loan.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

- M. Albert JANSSEN, former Minister of Finance (Belgian).
 Mr. JAY, of Morgan & Co., Paris (American).
 Mr. Marcus WALLENBERG, Vice-President of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank (Swedish).

Agent of the Trustees at Vienna :

Austrian National Bank, Vienna.

Representative of the Financial Committee at Vienna :

M. M. B. ROST VAN TONNINGEN, of Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).

*2. The Financial Reconstruction of Hungary.**Trustees for the 1924 Loan.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

- Cav. di Gr. Cr. Giuseppe BIANCHINI, President of the National Bankers' Federation (Italian).
 M. C. E. TER MEULEN, of Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH, Chairman of the Union Corporation, Ltd., London (South African).

Agent of the Trustees in Budapest :

Hungarian National Bank, Budapest.

Representative of the Financial Committee in Budapest :

Mr. Royall TYLER, of Hambro's Bank, Paris (American).

3. Adviser to the Bank of Greece.

Mr. H. C. F. FINLAYSON (British).

*4. Bulgaria.**(i) Settlement of Refugees.**(a) Honorary Commissioner of the League of Nations in Sofia.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. René CHARRON, of Lee, Higginson & Co., Paris (French).

(b) Trustees for the 1926 Loan.

(Appointed by the Council.)

- Cav. di Gr. Cr. Giuseppe BIANCHINI, President of the National Bankers' Federation (Italian).
 Sir Herbert LAWRENCE (British).
 Mr. Marcus WALLENBERG, Vice-President of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank (Swedish).

(ii) *Financial Stabilisation.*(a) *Trustees for the 1928 Loan.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

COUNT DE CHALENDAR (French).

SIR OTTO NIEMEYER, Bank of England (British).

(b) *Adviser to the Bulgarian National Bank.*

M. JEAN WATTEAU (French).

5. *Danzig :*(a) *Municipal Loan, 1925.*(b) *Free City Loan, 1927.**Trustee for Both Loans.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. C. E. TER MEULEN, of Hope & Co., Amsterdam (Dutch).

Agent of the Trustee :

Bank of Danzig, Danzig.

6. *Estonian Loan, 1927.**Trustee.*

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. ALBERT JANSSEN, former Minister of Finance (Belgian).

E. International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company.

(Appointed by the Council.)

M. E. REGARD, Vice-Governor of the *Crédit Foncier de France* (Chairman).M. DI NOLA, General Manager of the *Istituto Italiano di Credito Fondiario* (Vice-Chairman).*Organisation Committee :*

M. E. REGARD.

M. DI NOLA.

DR. BACHMANN, President of the National Bank of Switzerland.

DR. KISSLER, General Manager of the *Deutsche Rentenbank-Kreditanstalt*.

PROFESSOR MLYNARSKI, former Vice-Governor of the Bank of Poland.

SIR OTTO NIEMEYER, Bank of England, London.

DR. POSPISIL, Governor of the National Bank of Czechoslovakia.

M. VAN RIJN, Member of the Permanent Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture.

M. RYDBECK, Manager of the *Skandinaviska Kreditaktiebolaget*, Stockholm.*F. Committee of Statistical Experts.*M. M. CASARES, Director of the *Caja de Conversión* Buenos Aires (Argentine).

MR. R. H. COATS, Dominion Statistician, Canada (Canadian).

MR. DANA DURAND, formerly Chief of the Division of Statistical Research of the Department of Commerce, Washington (American).

MR. A. W. FLUX, Head of the Statistical Department, Board of Trade, London (British).

PROFESSOR C. GINI, Professor at the Royal University, Rome (Italian).

M. M. HUBER, Director of the General Statistical Department, France (French).

M. G. JAHN, Director of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Norway (Norwegian).

DR. LORENZ, President of the Commission of Social Statistics and Expert at the Department of Public Economy (Swiss).

DR. H. W. METHORST, Director-General, Statistical Office, The Hague (Dutch).

DR. E. WAGEMANN, President of the Statistical Office of the Reich, Berlin (German).

M. E. SZTUM DE SZTREM, Director of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Warsaw (Polish).

M. V. DORE, Representative of the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome (Italian).

MR. J. W. NIXON, Chief of Section, International Labour Office (British).

*G. The Fiscal Committee.*DR. HERBERT DORN (Chairman), President of the *Reichsfinanzhof*, Munich (German).

PROFESSOR TH. S. ADAMS, of Yale University (American).

M. HANS BLAU, Director of the Federal Administration of Taxes (Swiss).

DR. GINO BOLAFFI, Director, Head of Division, Directorate-General of Taxes, Ministry of Finance (Italian).

M. MARCEL BORDUGE, Director-General in the Ministry of Finance (on special service) (French).

M. CLAVIER, Director-General of Taxes, Ministry of Finance (Belgian).

M. DIEZ DE MEDINA, ex-Minister of Finance of Bolivia, Counsellor of the Bolivian Legation, Washington (Bolivian).

DR. FLORÈS DE LEMUS, Directorate-General of Public Revenue, Ministry of Finance (Spanish).

M. MANTZAVINOS, Director-General of Public Accounts, Ministry of Finance (Greek).
 Dr. J. H. R. SINNINGHE DAMSTÉ, Director-General of Taxes, Ministry of Finance (Dutch).
 Sir Percy THOMPSON, Vice-President of the Board of Inland Revenue (British).
 A member belonging to an Asiatic country.

Delegates of the Financial Committee :

Dr. Vilém POSPISIL.
 Dr. F. MLYNARSKI.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit.

The Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit, held at Geneva from October 12th to 24th, 1931, invited each of the five Powers permanently represented on the Council and also the thirteen following States to appoint one member of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit :

Argentina,	Hungary,
Belgium,	Poland,
China,	Portugal,
Cuba,	Spain,
Czechoslovakia,	Switzerland
Denmark,	Uruguay.
Finland,	

The final composition of the Committee, as well as that of its Sub-Committees, will be published in a later number of the *Monthly Summary*.

IV.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

I. COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

(Constituted in accordance with a resolution of the Second Assembly; the members are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

Professor Gilbert A. MURRAY (*Chairman*), Professor of Greek at Oxford University.
 M. Sanin CANO (Colombian), Man of Letters and Publicist.
 M. José CASTILLEJO, Professor of the Institutions of Roman Law at the University of Madrid.
 Mme. CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA (*Vice-Chairman*), Professor of Physics at Paris University; Honorary Professor of Warsaw University.
 M. J. DESTREE (*Vice-Chairman*), former Minister for Sciences and Arts.
 M. A. EINSTEIN, Professor of Physics at the Universities of Berlin and Leyden.
 M. Gösta S. FORSELL, Professor of Radiology at the University of Stockholm, Member of the Swedish Academy of Science.
 Mr. R. A. MILLIKAN, Director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics at the California Institute of Technology.
 M. Paul PAINLEVÉ, Member of the *Institut de France*.
 Sir Sarvapalli RADHAKRISHNAN, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Calcutta.
 M. G. de REYNOLD, Professor at Berne University; Chairman of the Swiss Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.
 M. Alfredo ROCCO, Professor of the Faculty of Political Sciences at Rome University, Chairman of the Italian National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation; Minister of Justice and Public Worship.
 M. Heinrich VON SRBİK, Professor of History at the University of Vienna.
 M. Joseph SUSTA, Professor of General History at Charles University, Prague, former Minister of Education.
 M. Aikitu TANAKADATE, Professor Emeritus at the Imperial University of Tokio, Member of the Imperial Academy of Science, Tokio, and its Representative in the House of Peers.
 M. N. TITULESCO, Professor at the University of Bucharest; Jurist; former Minister of Finance, former Foreign Minister.
 M. WU-SHI-FEE, Member of the Faculty of Peiyang University, Tientsin, and of the Nanyang College, Shanghai; Chairman of the Committee for the Unification of Pronunciation of the Chinese Language; Editor of the newspaper *Chung Hua Sin Pao*.

Representing the Secretary-General of the League of Nations :

M. A. DUFOUR-FERONCE, Minister Plenipotentiary; Under-Secretary-General of the League of Nations and Director of the Section of International Bureaux and Intellectual Co-operation.

Representing the International Labour Office :

M. F. MAURETTE, Chief of the Research Division.

Representing the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation :

M. H. BONNET, Director.

Executive Committee of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

The Executive Committee is delegated by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to carry on the work of intellectual co-operation between the Committee's sessions. It consists of the Chairmen of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and of the Governing Body of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, of five members of the Committee on Intellectual

Co-operation and three other persons elected by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation from outside its own membership.

Professor G. A. MURRAY (Chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation).
M. PAUL PAINLEVÉ (Chairman of the Governing Body of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation).

Mme. CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA.

M. CASTILLEJO.

M. DESTRIÉE.

M. DE REYNOLD.

M. ROCCO.

Members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Sir FRANK HEATH, Hon. Director of the Universities Bureau of the British Empire; Fellow of University College, London.

Dr. H. A. KRÜSS, Director-General of the Prussian State Library, Berlin.

M. P. ROLAND-MARCEL, former Administrator-General of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

2. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION, PARIS.

(a) *Governing Body.*

By agreement between the French Government and the Council of the League, the members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation also sit as the Governing Body of the International Institute.

(b) *Directors' Committee.*

Appointed by the Governing Body of the Institute with the approval of the Council of the League. Same members as the Executive Committee, under the chairmanship of the Chairman of the Governing Body; the three members of the Executive Committee who are not members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation sit in an advisory capacity on the Directors' Committee.

3. PERMANENT COMMITTEES OF EXPERTS.

(a) *Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters.*

(Constituted under a resolution of the Eleventh Assembly.)

M. DESTRIÉE (*Chairman*).

Professor Gilbert MURRAY.

M. DE REYNOLD.

Representatives of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Professor Bela BARTOK, Professor at the *Conservatoire* at Budapest, Composer and Orchestra Conductor (Hungarian).

M. Karel CAPEK, Author and Dramatist (Czechoslovak).

M. COSTA DU REIS, Writer (Bolivian).

M. Henri FOCILLON, Professor of the History of Art at the Sorbonne (French).

M. Julien LUCHAIRE, Director Emeritus of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (French).

M. Salvador DE MADARIAGA, former Professor of Spanish Literature at Oxford University; Ambassador to Paris (Spanish).

M. Thomas MANN, Author (German).

Mr. JOHN MASEFIELD, D.Litt., Poet Laureate of Great Britain (British).

M. UGO OJETTI, Author and Journalist (Italian).

M. GEORGES OPRESCU, Professor at Bucharest University, former Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation (Roumanian).

Professor Ragnar ÖSTBERG, Architect (Swedish).

M. R. PARIBENI, Directeur des Beaux-Arts in Italy; member of the Italian Royal Academy (Italian).

Mme. Nini ROLL-ANKER, Authoress (Norwegian).

M. JOSEF STRYGOWSKI, Professor of the History of Art at Vienna University (Austrian).

Mlle. H. VACARESCO, Authoress; member of the Roumanian Academy (Roumanian).

M. PAUL VALÉRY, Member of the Académie française (French).

Dr. A. W. WAETZOLDT, Director-General of Prussian Museums (German).

(b) *Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League of Nations.*

Professor Gilbert MURRAY (British).

M. DESTRIÉE (Belgian).

M. LUIS A. BARALT (Cuban), Professor and Author of Works on Pedagogy.

M. IVAN DJAYA, Professor at Belgrade University.

Mme. DREYFUS-BARNEY (French), Vice-President of the Peace Section of the International Council of Women.

Dr. STEPHEN P. DUGGAN (American), Director of the Institute of International Education.

Señora GALLAGHER-PARKS (Peruvian), Chairman of the Peruvian National Council of Women.

M. GIUSEPPE GALLAVRESI (Italian), Professor of History at the University of Milan.

M. C. KIRITZESCO (Roumanian), Director of Secondary Education at the Ministry of Education, Bucharest.

M. PETER MUNCH (Danish), Minister for Foreign Affairs; Author of several History Manuals.

M. ROSSET (French), Director of Primary Education at the Ministry of Education, Paris.

M. W. SCHELLBERG (German), Counsellor at the Ministry of Education, Prussia.

Professor SESHADRI (Indian), Principal of Santana Dhama College, Cawnpore.
 M. P. T. SHEN (Chinese), Director of the Franco-Chinese Institute, Lyons.
 Professor Alfred ZIMMERN (British), Professor of International Relations, Oxford University.

(c) *Directors' Committee of the International Museums Office.*

M. Jules DESTREÉE (*Chairman*), Member of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, former Minister for Science and Arts (Belgian).
 M. D. BAUD-BOVY (Swiss), Chairman of the Swiss Federal Committee of Fine Arts.
 Mr. L. VAIL COLEMAN (American), Director of the American Museums Association.
 M. Sanchez y CANTON (Spanish), Assistant Director of the Prado Museum at Madrid.
 M. R. DUPIERREUX (Belgian), Professor at the Antwerp Institute of Fine Arts.
 Sir Cecil HARCOURT SMITH (British), Surveyor of His Majesty the King of England's works of art.
 M. R. GRAUL (German), former Director of the Art Museums of Leipzig.
 M. GUIFFREY (French), Keeper of the paintings and drawings at the Louvre Museum.
 M. F. PELLATI (Italian), Chief Inspector of Fine Arts in Italy.

(d) *Sub-Committee on the Interchange of Teaching Staff.*

Professor Gilbert MURRAY.
 Mlle. BONNEVIE.
 M. BRUNSCHVIG.
 M. CASTILLEJO.

M. DUFOUR-FERONCE.
 Mr. Vernon KELLOGG.
 M. MILLIKAN.
 M. OPRESCU.

4. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CINEMATOGRAPHIC INSTITUTE, ROME.

(a) *Governing Body.*

(Appointed under Council resolutions of September 1928, March 1929, September 1929, January and May 1931, the members act in their individual capacity.)

Professor Alfredo ROCCO (Italian) (*Chairman*).
 Dr. Leon CHRZANOWSKI (Polish), former Head of the Press Bureau at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
 Dr. Hans CÜRLIS (German), Chairman of the German Association of Film Producers.
 M. Jules DESTREÉE (Belgian), Vice-Chairman of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation; former Minister for Science and Arts.
 Dr. Thomas E. FINEGAN (American), Director of the Eastman Teaching Films, Rochester, N.Y.
 Professor Henri FOCILLON (French), Professor at the Sorbonne.
 Mr. G. T. HANKIN (British), Board of Education, London.
 Dr. Hugo KRÜSS (German), Director of the Prussian State Library, Berlin.
 M. Louis LUMIÈRE (French), Member of the Institute of France.
 Mr. Carl MILLIKEN (American), Secretary-General of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors (U.S.A.).
 Mlle. Gabriela MISTRAL (Chilian), former Headmistress of a secondary school for girls; Authoress.
 M. Georges OPRESCU (Roumanian), Professor at the University of Bucharest.
 Professor Gonzague DE REYNOLD (Swiss), Member of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.
 Count CARTON DE WIART (Belgian), Member of the Child Welfare Committee.
 M. S. YOSHIDA (Japanese), Ambassador to Rome.

(b) *Permanent Executive Committee.*

(Appointed by the Governing Body of the Institute, with the approval of the Council of the League.)

M. A. ROCCO (*Chairman*).
 Count CARTON DE WIART.
 Professor FOCILLON.
 Dr. Hugo KRÜSS.
 Mr. Carl MILLIKEN.
 M. DE REYNOLD.

The following have the right to take part in an advisory capacity in the sessions of the Governing Body and the Permanent Executive Committee, either in person or through a representative:

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations.
 The Director of the International Labour Office.
 The Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.
 The President of the International Institute of Agriculture.

* * * *

5. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE AT ROME FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW.

(a) *Governing Body.*

M. Vittorio SCIALOJA (Italian) (*President*), Minister of State, Senator.
 M. ADATCI (Japanese), President of the Permanent Court of International Justice.
 M. CAPITANT (French), Professor of Civil Law at the Faculty of Law, University of Paris.
 M. DESTREÉE (Belgian), Deputy, former Belgian Minister of Science and Arts.
 M. FERNANDES (Brazilian), former Ambassador at Brussels.
 Sir Cecil Barrington HURST (British), Judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

M. LODER (Netherlands), former President and Judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice.
 M. RABEL (German), Professor at Berlin University.
 M. ROCCO (Italian), Minister of Justice.
 M. RUNDSTEIN (Polish), Legal Adviser to the Polish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
 M. TITULESCO (Roumanian), Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in London.
 M. UNDÉN (Swedish), Chancellor of the University of Upsala.
 M. VILLEGAS (Chilian), Ambassador in London.
 M. Felipe Sanchez ROMAN (Spanish).

(b) *Permanent Committee.*

M. SCIALOJA.
 M. VILLEGAS.
 M. RABEL.

M. DESTREE.
 M. ADATCI.

V. — ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSIONS, MANDATES, MINORITIES, ETC.

I. THE PERMANENT MANDATES COMMISSION.

(Constituted under paragraph 9 of Article 22 of the Covenant. The members are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

Marquis A. THEODOLI (*Chairman*), former Under-Secretary of State at the Colonial Ministry (Italian).
 M. D. F. W. VAN REES (*Vice-Chairman*), former Vice-Chairman of the Council of the Netherlands East Indies (Netherlands).
 Mlle. V. DANNEVIG, Principal of the Vestheim High School, Oslo (Norwegian).
 Lord LUGARD, former Governor of Nigeria (British).
 M. M. MERLIN, Honorary Governor-General of Colonies (French).
 M. Pierre ORTS, Minister Plenipotentiary (Belgian).
 M. L. PALACIOS, former Under-Secretary of State, Professor at Madrid University (Spanish).
 Count DE PENHA GARCIA, former Minister of Finance, Vice-President of the International Colonial Institute at Brussels (Portuguese).
 M. William RAPPARD, Professor at Geneva University (Swiss).
 Dr. J. RUPPEL, former Director at the Finance Ministry (German).
 M. N. SAKENOBÉ, former Minister of Japan in Chile (Japanese).

Representative of the International Labour Organisation :

Mr. C. W. H. WEAVER.

2. SAAR BASIN GOVERNING COMMISSION.

(Constituted under the Treaty of Versailles. The members are appointed for one year by the Council in an individual capacity.)

Mr. KNOX (*Chairman*) (British).
 M. D'EHNRROOTH (Finnish).
 M. KOSSMANN (Saar).
 M. MORIZE (French).
 M. ZORICIC (Yugoslav).

3. HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN DANZIG.

(Appointed under Article 103 of the Treaty of Versailles.)
 Count Manfredi GRAVINA (Italian).

4. PRESIDENT OF THE UPPER SILESIAN MIXED COMMISSION.

(Appointed by the Council under the German-Polish Convention on Upper Silesia.)
 M. Félix CALONDER (Swiss).

5. PRESIDENT OF THE UPPER SILESIAN ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL.

(Appointed by the Council under the German-Polish Convention on Upper Silesia.)
 M. G. KAECKENBEECK (Belgian).

6. GRECO-TURKISH EXCHANGE OF POPULATION COMMISSION.

(Three members, including the President, are appointed by the Council under the Greco-Turkish Exchange of Populations Convention.)

M. H. HOLSTAD (Norwegian).
 M. Holger ANDERSEN (Danish).

VI. — SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

1. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

(Constituted under a resolution of the First Assembly. The members represent their Governments; the assessors are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

Austria	Dr. Bruno SCHULTZ.
Belgium	M. CARNOY.
Bolivia	Dr. Manuel CUELLAR.
China	—
Egypt	T. W. RUSSELL Pasha.
France	M. BOURGOIS.
Germany	Dr. KÄHLER.
Great Britain	Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE.
India	Sir John CAMPBELL.
Italy	M. CAVAZZONI.
Japan	M. SAWADA.
Mexico	M. Salvador MARTINEZ DE ALVA.
Netherlands	M. W. G. VAN WETTUM.
Poland	Dr. CHODZKO.
Portugal	Dr. A. DE VASCONCELLOS.
Siam	Prince DAMRAS.
Spain	M. Julio CASARES.
Switzerland	Dr. CARRIÈRE.
United States of America	Mr. J. K. CALDWELL (appointed by his Government to attend in an unofficial capacity).
Uruguay	M. Alfredo DE CASTRO.
Yugoslavia	M. FOTITCH.

Assessors :

Mr. L. A. LYALL, former Commissioner of the Chinese Maritime Customs.
M. A. H. SIRKS, Chief of the Rotterdam Police, Rotterdam.

2. THE PERMANENT CENTRAL OPIUM BOARD.

(Constituted under Article 19 of the Geneva Convention of 1925. Its members are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

M. Lucide AGEL (French).
Dr. ANSELMINO (German).
Professor GALLAVRESI (Italian).
Mr. L. A. LYALL (British).
Mr. H. L. MAY (American).
M. M. MIYAJIMA (Japanese).
M. Dragan MILICEVIC (Yugoslav).

3. ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR THE PROTECTION AND WELFARE OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

(Is composed of the Traffic in Women and Children Committee and of the Child Welfare Committee.)

(Reconstituted in 1925 under a resolution of the Fifth Assembly. Its members are appointed by and represent their Governments; the assessors are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

Members (the Members sit on both Committees) :

Belgium	Count CARTON DE WIART.
British Empire	Mr. S. W. HARRIS.
Denmark	Mme. Estrid HEIN.
France	M. REGNAULT.
Germany	Mme. Gertrud BAUMER.
Italy	—
Japan	M. SAWADA.
Poland	Dr. CHODZKO.
Roumania	M. COMNENE.
Spain	—
United States	Miss ABBOTT.
Uruguay	Dr. Paulina LUISI.

Assessors for Traffic in Women and Children Committee :

Mr. S. COHEN, Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women.
Dame Rachel CROWDY.
Mme. CURCHOD-SECRETAN, *Fédération internationale des Amies de la jeune fille.*
Mlle. LAVIELLE, *Union Internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques.*
Mme. DE MONTENACH, *Association catholique internationale des œuvres de protection de la jeune fille.*
Mme. AVRIL DE SAINTE-CROIX, Women's International Organisations.
Mr. SEMPINS, International Bureau for Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children.
Liaison Officer with the International Labour Office.

Assessors for Child Welfare Committee :

Mlle. BURNIAUX, International Federation of Trade Unions.
 Dr. Fanny DALMAZZO, *Union internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques*.
 Dame Katherine FURSE, International Organisation of Boy Scouts and Girl Guides.
 Dr. HUMBERT, League of Red Cross Societies.
 M. Jorge VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE, Pan-American Conference on Child Welfare.
 Miss Julia LATHROP, National Conference of Social Work (U.S.A.).
 Dr. POLLIGKEIT, *Union internationale de Secours aux enfants*.
 Mlle. Emilie GOURD, Women's International Organisations.
 M. Henri ROLLET, *Association internationale pour la protection de l'enfance*.
 Miss Charlotte WHITTON, Social Service Council of Canada and Canadian Council of Child Welfare.
 Dame Rachel CROWDY.
 Mr. Bascom JOHNSON.

Liaison Officers :

Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.
 Mr. JOHNSTON, International Labour Office.
 M. VELGHE, Health Organisation of the League of Nations.

4. PERMANENT COMMITTEE THE INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

Dr. W. KÜLZ (*Chairman*).
 Senator CIRAOLO.
 Senator A. FRANÇOIS.

5. COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON SLAVERY.

(Appointed by the Council in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Assembly on September 25th, 1931. The members are appointed in an individual capacity.)

M. J. ANGOUVANT, Honorary Governor-General of the Colonies, former Governor of French West Africa, former Governor of French Equatorial Africa.
 Mme. L. DE CASTRO E AVMEIDA, Delegate of Portugal to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.
 M. A. GOHR, former Director-General at the Belgian Ministry for the Colonies and ex-Member of the Committee of Experts for Native Labour; ex-Chairman of the Temporary Slavery Commission.
 Lord LUGARD, Member of the Permanent Mandates Commission; former Governor of Nigeria, ex-Member of the Temporary Slavery Commission.
 M. A. NEYTZELL DE WILDE, ex-President of the Legislative Assembly of the Dutch Indies; at present Chief of the Division for League of Nations and legal affairs at the Ministry for the Colonies, The Hague.
 M. LÓPEZ OLIVÁN, former Director-General of Morocco and the Colonies, Madrid.
 Comm. ZEDDA, former Secretary-General to the Government of Erythrea.
 An Observer from the International Labour Office.
 Mr. E. F. PHELAN, Chief of the Diplomatic Division of the International Labour Office.

6. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL REFUGEE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(Constituted under a resolution of the Ninth Assembly.)

Government Members :

Belgium	M. A. FRANÇOIS.
British Empire	Mr. H. PATTESON.
Bulgaria	M. D. MIKOFF.
China	M. CHEN-TING.
Czechoslovakia	Dr. FIERLINGER.
Estonia	M. A. SCHMIDT.
France	M. DE NAVAILLES-LABATUT.
Germany	Dr. VOELCKERS.
Greece	M. R. RAPHAEL.
Italy	M. Quinto MAZZOLINI.
Latvia	M. J. FELDMANS.
Poland	M. Th. GWIAZDOWSKI.
Roumania	M. C. ANTONIADE.
Yugoslavia	M. I. CHUMENKOVITCH.

Consultative Members :

Sir Eric DRUMMOND, Secretary-General of the League of Nations.
 M. Albert THOMAS, Director of the International Labour Office.
 M. Max HUBER, President of the Nansen International Office for Refugees.

Consultative Members nominated by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office :

M. G. CURCIN, Vice-President of the Federation of Industrial Corporations, Belgrade.
 M. Herman MÜLLER, Vice-President, General Confederation of the German Trades Union.

Technical Advisers :

M. C. GOULKEVITCH. }
 Baron B. NOLDE. } Council of former Russian Ambassadors.
 Mr. W. A. MACKENZIE, " Save the Children " Fund International Union.
 Mr. L. B. GOLDEN, British United Committee.
 M. A. KHATISSIAN, Delegation of the Armenian Republic.
 M. L. PACHALIAN, Central Committee of Armenian Refugees.
 Captain C. PETERSEN, League of Red Cross Societies.
 M. J. RUBINSTEIN, Central Committee on the Situation of Russian Refugees.

VII. — FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. SUPERVISORY COMMISSION.

(Constituted under a resolution of the Second Assembly. The members are appointed by the Assembly in an individual capacity.¹)

Dr. Stefan OSUSKÝ (Czechoslovak).
 Lord MESTON OF AGRA (India).
 M. Carl Joachim HAMBRO (Norwegian).
 Dr. C. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuelan).
 M. Jean RÉVEILLAUD (French).

Substitute Members :

M. Jean DE MODZELEWSKI (Polish).
 M. Georges DE OTTLIK (Hungarian).

Auditor of League Accounts :

M. A. CERESA (Italian).

Deputy Auditor :

Dr. F. VIVALDI (Italian).

2. COMMITTEE ON THE ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES.

(Constituted under a resolution of the First Assembly. The members are appointed by the Council in an individual capacity.)

M. J. RÉVEILLAUD (*Chairman*) (French).
 Dr. H. F. BERGER (German).
 Dr. A. LOPEZ (Colombian).
 Dr. Bogdan MARKOVITCH (Yugoslav).
 Mr. F. PHILLIPS (British).
 M. N. SATO (Japanese).
 M. SOLERI (Italian).
 Sir Henry STRAKOSCH (South African).
 M. ZAHLE (Danish).

Deputy Members :

Dr. P. JACOBSSON (Swedish).
 Dr. R. P. PARANJPYE (Indian).

3. THE BUILDING COMMITTEE.

Sir Eric DRUMMOND, Secretary-General.
 Marquis PAULUCCI DI CALBOLI BARONE, Under-Secretary-General in Charge of Internal Administration.
 M. DUFOUR-FERONCE, Under-Secretary-General, Director of Section of International Bureaux and Intellectual Co-operation.
 Mr. S. JACKLIN, Treasurer.
 Mr. H. B. BUTLER, Deputy Director, International Labour Office.
 Mr. BROESE VAN GROENOU, Architect, The Hague.
 M. FLORESTANO DI FAUSTO, Architect, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Rome.
 Dr. Wilhelm KREIS, Architect, Dresden.
 Mr. J. H. MARKHAM, Architect, H.M. Office of Works, London.
 M. Gilbert PEYCELON, Director of the *Journal Officiel* Paris.
 M. E. STREIT-BARON, Geneva.

Substitute Members :

M. Arturo BIANCHI, Architect, Rome (substitute for M. Florestano di Fausto).
 M. Louis BOUET, Geneva (substitute for M. Streit-Baron).
 Mr. F. W. L. CLOUX, Architect, London (substitute for Mr. Markham).
 M. Jacquot, Paris (substitute for M. Peycelon).

¹See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. X, No. 9, page 193.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL.

Judges :

M. MONTAGNA (*President for 1932*).
 M. FROELICH (*Vice-President for 1932*).
 M. DEVÈZE.

Deputy Judges :

M. EIDE.
 M. TOMCSANYI.
 M. VAN RYCKEVORSEL.

Registrar :

M. J. NISOT.

Deputy Registrar :

M. GUERREAU.

ANNEX II.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

(Constituted under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Judges are elected by the Assembly and the Council for a period of nine years.)

Judges :

M. ADATCI (*Japanese*).
 M. ANZILOTTI (*Italian*).
 M. FROMAGEOT (*French*).
 Sir Cecil HURST (*British*).
 M. ALTAMIRA Y CREVEA (*Spanish*).
 M. VAN EYSINGA (*Dutch*).
 M. GUERRERO (*Salvador*).
 Baron ROLIN-JAEQUEMYNS (*Belgian*).

Mr. KELLOGG (*American*).
 Count ROSTWOROWSKI (*Polish*).
 M. SCHÜCKING (*German*).
 M. WANG CHUNG HUI (*Chinese*).
 M. DE BUSTAMANTE Y SIRVEN (*Cuban*).
 M. NEGULESCO (*Roumanian*).
 M. URRUTIA (*Colombian*).

Deputy Judges :

M. ERICH (*Finnish*).
 M. DA MATTA (*Portuguese*).

M. NOVAKOVITCH (*Yugoslav*).
 M. REDLICH (*Austrian*).

Registrar :

M. HAMMARSKJÖLD (*Swedish*).

Deputy Registrar :

M. L. J. H. JORSTAD (*Norwegian*).

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly).

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price : per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents ; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly) :

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price : per number, 8d., 15 cents ; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals) :

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription : 5s. \$1.25

4. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual) :

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints) : 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints) : 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual) :

Price : 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly) :

Published every two months ; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price : per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents ; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (*Trilingual*) (Quarterly) :

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price : per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents ; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (*Trilingual*) (Annual) :

Price : 1s. \$0.25

9. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual) :

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription : 40s. \$10.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription : 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published :—

Vocational Guidance in Agriculture.	vii + 244 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
Colour Vision Tests.	47 pp.	2s.	\$0.50
*Unemployment and Public Works.	186 pp.	4s.	\$1.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations.	xii + 263 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s.	\$1.25
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky.	v + 212 pp.		4s.	\$1.00
Silicosis : Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August 1930.	iv + 692 pp.	16s.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931.	iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s.	\$1.50
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler	v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
		{ Cloth bound	4s.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building.	xii. + 378 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation.	vii + 381 pp.	8s.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene.	vii. + 188 pp.	6s.	\$1.50

11. SPECIAL REPORTS :

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION : £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include :—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY :

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price : 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE :

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)	£3 3s. od.	\$16.00
Volume edition (in two volumes)	{ Paper bound	£3 3s. od.	\$16.00
	{ Cloth bound	£3 10s. od.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address : INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following :

GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. M. R. K. BURGE,
12, Victoria Street,
London, S.W. 1.
(Telegrams : Interlab,
Sowest, London.)
Telephone : Victoria, 2859.)

U.S.A.

American Sales Agents :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, Mount Vernon Street,
Boston 9, Mass.

JAPAN

Mr. J. ASARI,
Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya
Park, Kojimachiku,
Tokio. (Telegrams :
Kokusairodo, Tokio.
Telephone : Ginza 1580.)

INDIA

Mr. P. P. PILLAI,
International Labour Office
(Indian Branch)
New Delhi.
(Telegrams : Interlab,
New Delhi.)

Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments

Survey of Proposals made by Various Delegations during the General Discussion.

(Document No. : Conf. D. 99).

This document has been prepared in conformity with the decision taken by the Conference on February 24th, 1932.

It comprises a survey of the proposals made during the general discussion by thirty-three delegations, and is divided into the following chapters :

- I.—Organisation of Peace.
- II.—Directives and Principles of a General Order for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.
- III.—Draft Convention drawn up by the Preparatory Commission : Attitude of the Various Delegations.
- IV.—Alternative or Complementary Drafts of Conventions.
- V.—Personnel.
- VI.—Material of Land Armaments.
- VII.—Material of Naval Armaments.
- VIII.—Material of Air Armaments.
- IX.—Expenditure on National Defence.
- X.—Chemical and Bacteriological Arms.
- XI.—Publicity (Exchange of Information).
- XII.—Supervision (Permanent Disarmament Commission).
- XIII.—Special Provisions to be Inserted in the Convention.
- XIV.—Trade in Arms, Ammunition, and War Material.
- XV.—Manufacture of Arms, Ammunition, and War Material.
- XVI.—Restrictions and Interdictions of the Use of Certain Arms and Protection of Civilian Populations.
- XVII.—Establishment of Demilitarised Zones.

The Price of the Document is
2/6 or 60 cents.

Orders should be addressed to the Agents of the League of Nations Publications, or to the Publications Department, League of Nations, Geneva.

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 3.

MARCH, 1932

Appeal of the Chinese
Government.

Special Session of the
Assembly.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 3.

MARCH, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month</i> , March, 1932 .	79	<i>The Permanent Court of</i>	
II. <i>Appeal of the Chinese Government</i> :		<i>International Justice.</i>	
Special Session of the Assembly .	80	1. Sessions of the Court	114
III. <i>Conference for the Reduction and</i>		2. Caphandaris - Molloff Agreement of	
<i>Limitation of Armaments</i>	110	December 9th, 1927	114
IV. <i>Technical Organisations</i> :		3. Legal Status of certain parts of Eastern	
Economic and Financial Organisa-		Greenland	115
tion	111	4. Delimitation of the Territorial Waters	
Meeting of the Financial Committee .	111	between the Island of Castellorizo and	
V. <i>Obituary</i> :		the Coasts of Anatolia	115
1. Death of M. Briand	111	5. New Edition of the Collection of Texts	
2. Death of Colonel de Reynier	112	governing the jurisdiction of the	
3. Death of M. Sokal	113	Court	115
VI. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	113	6. The Protocols of September 14th, 1929 .	116

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

March, 1932.

The work of the League of Nations in March was marked by an event of exceptional importance. For the second time in the League's history the Assembly met in special session, the meeting having been called at the request of the Chinese Government under Article 15 of the Covenant.

After nine days of continuous work in commission and plenary meetings the Assembly succeeded in securing unanimity on a resolution which, in addition to laying down certain principles governing the settlement of this or any other international dispute, provided for the constitution of a Special Commission with a wide mandate of report and advice. The Assembly remains in session, and its President may convene it again as soon as he deems this necessary.

The six Commissions of the Disarmament Conference, on General, Political, Land, Sea and Air and Budget Questions continued their discussion until March 19th, when they rose for the Easter recess. The Conference will resume work on April 11th.

The financial situation of Austria, Hungary, Greece and Bulgaria was studied by the Financial Committee at a meeting in Paris from March 3rd until March 24th. The report will be considered at a meeting of the Council in April.

The twenty-fourth session of the Permanent Court of International Justice closed on March 8th, on which date the Court delivered its advisory opinion in regard to certain questions relating to the Molloff-Caphandaris Agreement on the financial aspect of Greco-Bulgarian inter-migration.

* * *

The League suffered a great loss in the person of one of its foremost supporters, Aristide Briand, who died on March 7th. A special tribute was paid to his memory by the Assembly.

Two other prominent collaborators died during the month—the recently appointed Chairman of the Syro-Iraqi Frontier Commission, Colonel James de Reynier (Swiss), who was killed on League service in an airplane

accident, and M. Sokal, Permanent Delegate of Poland to the League.

M. Sokal had been a member of many important League Commissions, and had been Chairman of the Committee on the Organisa-

tion of the Secretariat. He had also been from its beginning a member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation and was President of the International Labour Conference in 1931.

II.—APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

(a) SPECIAL SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY.

The special session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, summoned by the Council at the request of the Chinese Government under Article 15 of the Covenant, opened at Geneva on March 3rd. Of the fifty-five States Members of the League the fifty following States sent representatives:—

Abyssinia, South Africa, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, British Empire, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Salvador, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The Argentine Republic, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Paraguay did not send delegates.

Opening Speech and Election of the Bureau.

The session was opened by the Acting President of the Council, M. Paul-Boncour (France). Recalling that this was only the second time, since the foundation of the League, that the Assembly had met in extraordinary session, the speaker rapidly surveyed the efforts made by the Council, first under Article 11, then under Article 15 of the Covenant for the settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute. He concluded:

"The mere fact that armistice negotiations are continuing and that both parties have explicitly accepted a plan which is itself conditional on the cessation of hostilities means that our present deliberations are opening under auspices which I shall refrain from describing as more favourable, lest I be accused of exaggeration, but which are certainly less unfavourable than we feared at the tragic moment when this Assembly was convened.

And now it is for you to take up the discussion. The League took a very serious step when for the first time it decided to convene a special Assembly in virtue of a procedure laid down in Article 15 of the Covenant."

The credentials of the delegates were then examined and the Assembly appointed its bureau.

M. Paul Hymans (Belgium) was elected

President by forty-five votes out of forty-seven cast. M. Paul-Boncour (France), M. Motta (Switzerland), Baron Ramel (Sweden), Sir John Simon (British Empire), M. Grandi (Italy), M. Ortega (Mexico), M. Brüning (Germany) and M. Sepahbodi (Persia) were elected Vice-Presidents, the Assembly having decided that the number of Vice-Presidents should, exceptionally, be eight instead of six, as provided in the Rules.

Thanking his colleagues for this token of confidence, M. Hymans said:

"In taking this chair, my memory inevitably goes back, as you will well understand, to the First Assembly of the League in 1920, over which I had the honour to preside. At that time we were setting forth, with high hopes and in face of scepticism, upon a bold and noble enterprise—the organisation of an old association of States for the purpose (to quote the actual terms of the Preamble to the Covenant) of maintaining justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of peoples with one another.

And now, an Assembly of the League is called upon for the first time, in virtue of the obligation imposed upon it by Article 15 of the Covenant, to settle a complex dispute, fraught with danger, which has broken out between two great nations of the East and has unhappily led to bloodshed. . . .

Both as President of this Assembly and as representative of a State which holds respect for treaties to be the essential principle in international life, I shall, like the rest of you, devote myself wholeheartedly and sincerely to seeking any means and any methods likely to restore concord through justice and to strengthen the authority of the League."

Constitution of the General Commission.

The Assembly agreed upon its method of work in the afternoon of March 3rd. On the proposal of its bureau, it decided to appoint a General Commission, on which all States would be represented, to deal with the whole question on the agenda and to report to the Assembly. It then heard the statements of the Chinese and Japanese delegations, and rose, the General Commission having been summoned for the next day.

Debate on the Cessation of Hostilities at Shanghai.

After inviting M. Paul Hymans to take the Chair, and deciding that the Bureau of the Assembly should also act as its Bureau, the

General Commission immediately attacked the question of the cessation of hostilities at Shanghai. On this point the information received by the parties did not entirely agree.

On March 3rd, in his statement to the Assembly, the Chinese delegate, M. Yen, had announced that the armistice negotiations opened at Shanghai had been broken off. On February 29th, as a result of negotiations which had taken place in Shanghai Harbour on board the British vessel *Kent*, the Chinese Government had accepted proposals based on the principle of simultaneous evacuation by both parties, but the Japanese Government, after a big offensive on March 1st, had, on March 2nd, presented proposals which, in the opinion of the Chinese Government, were tantamount to the flat rejection of the principle upon which the agreed proposals were based.

On the same day the Japanese delegate, M. Matsudaira, informed the Assembly that, at 2 o'clock on March 3rd (Shanghai time), General Shirakawa had announced that the Japanese troops had received orders to halt at the positions they were actually occupying and to cease all fighting, provided the Chinese took no further hostile action.

The General Commission began by discussing the difference between these statements.

M. Paul Hymans said that he had received in the morning a letter from M. Yen to the effect that the Chinese Commander had proclaimed the cessation of hostilities at midnight on March 3rd, but that the Japanese had continued to attack. "This news," he said, "naturally created an unfortunate impression. We are receiving contradictory information. This situation cannot continue."

Replying to the President, M. Matsudaira handed him a communication from his Government to the effect that the Japanese army had ceased hostilities and had no intention of resuming them, but was still from time to time being fired upon by Chinese soldiers and, in this case, was returning their fire.

To clear up the matter M. Yen proposed that the Assembly should ask the British, French, Italian and American Admirals in Shanghai to ascertain whether hostilities had really ceased. The Assembly, he added, could authorise them to see that hostilities did cease for an indefinite period of time during which an armistice might be concluded. He also suggested that the Assembly might send general instructions through these four officers as to the principles upon which an armistice should be based. The Secretary-General announced that he had wired the day before to the Committee set up at Shanghai for information,

The Committee, he thought, might not be in a position to furnish full information with regard to events taking place at some distance from the town; and it was his intention to ask the Powers with military, naval and civil authorities on the spot if they would furnish information regarding the cessation of hostilities.

The British, French and Italian delegates stated that their Governments would communicate to the Assembly any information received from Shanghai.

M. Sato, replacing M. Matsudaira, emphasised that hostilities had actually ceased, and that only a few skirmishes were still taking place. His delegation hoped that the negotiations for an armistice would lead to a tangible result in the shortest possible time. The Japanese Government saw no objection to the Powers directly concerned in the maintenance of security at Shanghai taking part in these negotiations, which, it thought, might even be extended to the maintenance of order in the zone evacuated by the two forces. The much wider question of security in the Shanghai district could be examined at a round table conference as soon as an agreement had been reached for the cessation of hostilities. In conclusion, M. Sato declared that the Japanese troops sent in reinforcement would leave the territory as and when conditions as to tranquillity had been regulated, and that the technical details of their withdrawal would also be considered by the Shanghai conference.

M. Yen then read three telegrams which his delegation had just received. They announced that Japanese transports were now pouring troops into the region of Woo Sung, that thirty-five thousand men with tanks and cavalry had landed near Kuansan, about forty-five miles west of Shanghai, that eight Japanese transports had entered the Yangtse in the afternoon of March 4th and that clear fighting was in progress. The Chinese delegate asked the Assembly to take suitable measures to ensure that the cessation of hostilities was real and would be maintained until formal armistice terms had been arranged.

M. Sato replied that the extension of hostilities in the region of Shanghai had compelled the Japanese Government to send reinforcements, which were then arriving, and that it was not yet possible to determine the details of their withdrawal. This was why the Japanese Government proposed the convocation as soon as possible of a conference to investigate the question of the cessation of hostilities and likewise those of the evacuation of the forces and the return of the troops.

After stating that the disquieting news

communicated by M. Yen accentuated the painful uncertainty in which the Assembly had opened, the President, summarising the debate, noted that the vital consideration for all concerned was the avoidance of further bloodshed. He therefore proposed that the meeting should be suspended to enable the bureau to prepare a draft resolution on the cessation of hostilities which might serve as a basis for the discussions of the Commission.

The draft resolution presented when the Commission resumed work was as follows (only some very slight modifications were made subsequently):

"The Assembly,

"Recalling the suggestions made by the Council on February 29th and without prejudice to the other measures thereunder envisaged;

"(1) Calls upon the Governments of China and Japan to take immediately the necessary measures to ensure that the orders which, as it has been informed, have been issued by the military commanders on both sides for the cessation of hostilities, shall be made effective;

"(2) Requests the other Powers which have special interests in the Shanghai Settlements to inform the Assembly of the manner in which the invitation set out in the previous paragraph has been executed;

"(3) Recommends that negotiations be entered into by the Chinese and Japanese representatives, with the assistance of the military, naval and civilian authorities of the Powers mentioned above for the conclusion of arrangements which shall render definite the cessation of hostilities and regulate the withdrawal of the Japanese forces. The Assembly will be glad to be kept informed by the Powers mentioned above of the development of these negotiations"

M. Sato proposed the addition of the words "*et de régler les conditions et modalités du retrait des forces japonaises ainsi que la situation future des forces chinoises*" in paragraph 3 after the words "*cessation des hostilités*."

After an exchange of views between the Japanese delegate and the President,* the

* The PRESIDENT: There is a very marked difference of meaning between the word "*modalités*" and the word "*conditions*." A condition signifies a fact by which the withdrawal would be conditioned; that is M. Sato's idea. Those who drafted the resolution had no such idea in mind; they were thinking of the technical conditions governing the withdrawal of the forces, whereas the word "*conditions*" might include political conditions.

M. SATO (Japan): All these points will be settled on the spot, where all the circumstances necessitating the establishment of *modalités* or *conditions* for the withdrawal of the Japanese forces will be taken into account. We are anxious to place no impediment in the way of the consideration of the present position. The technical arrangements (*modalités*) for withdrawal can be decided only by taking into consideration the position existing on the spot.

In our view, the withdrawal of the Japanese troops is conditioned by certain essential circumstances. If the word "*conditions*" is too strong, I am entirely prepared to accept any other term which will meet the same object, but the main-

former stated that he was obliged to press for a little more precision in the text of the resolution. The President explained that, as President, he had offered a few comments on the draft resolution, adding:

"At the stage we have now reached the Assembly itself must speak. We have here representatives of fifty States. It would be desirable and helpful if the representatives of some of these States could make their views known to the Commission and the public."

M. Motta (Switzerland) made a friendly and pressing appeal to M. Sato to accept the draft resolutions as it stood. Under Article 15, he said, it was possible for the Assembly to pass valid resolutions, provided the States Members of the Council present were unanimous and that there was a majority of the other States. He urged that there should be not only legal unanimity, but complete moral unanimity in the Assembly, including Japan and China. The principle of the withdrawal of the Japanese troops must not be questioned and therefore the proposed modification was inadmissible.

Dr. Beneš (Czechoslovakia) said that he fully agreed with the explanation given by M. Motta of the legal situation and supported the second part of his proposal:

"It would, I think, be highly dangerous," he said, "to leave anything uncertain, unclear or ambiguous in a document of this kind. It is essential for us as well as for the world public opinion, and particularly public opinion in the Far East, to know exactly where we stand."

After making certain reservations in regard to Article 15 and the opinion expressed by M. Motta as to the validity of a vote under these conditions, M. Sato said that, although anxious to have a clearer text, he would not object to the adoption of the draft resolution as it stood.†

On the proposal of Sir John Simon, the Commission decided to bring the French version of

ance of security and the maintenance of order, which engenders the feeling of security, and the protection of the lives and property of Japanese nationals, are conditions on which we must insist before the withdrawal can be carried out.

The PRESIDENT: There is, I think, a shade of difference between M. Sato's language and that used by myself. When we speak of *conditions* and *modalités*, the idea, I think, in the minds of those who drew up the draft resolution is that all questions relating to security form part of the arrangements which are to be negotiated on the spot, "arrangements which will render definite the cessation of hostilities and regulate the withdrawal of the Japanese forces."

That is a problem with many complex facets; we cannot solve it here in all its aspects. Those who are on the spot and who are acquainted with the exact position will be specially qualified to settle it.

† On the occasion of the vote in the General Commission M. Sato said: We are anxious to have a clearer text, I will not say one which will give us entire satisfaction, but one which will, at any rate,

the resolution into line with the English text. The word "*à régler le retrait*" were therefore substituted for the original text "*à régler les modalités du retrait*." (Paragraph 3.)

Thus framed, the resolution was unanimously adopted by the General Commission and by the Assembly, summoned in the same room a few minutes after the meeting of the General Commission.

Communication from the Secretary of State of the United States.

As the Assembly resolution of March 4th referred to "Powers with special interests in the Shanghai settlements," Sir Eric Drummond communicated it to M. Hugh Wilson, United States Minister in Berne. In reply, the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, asked Mr. Wilson to inform the Secretary-General that he had requested the American military authorities at Shanghai to co-operate.

General Discussion.

On March 5th, 7th and 8th the General Commission proceeded to a comprehensive discussion of the whole of the problem of the Sino-Japanese dispute. Delegates of thirty-three States came to the platform to express the views of their Governments. In view of the general importance of the discussion, the principal extracts of the speeches are given below :

M. Braadland (Norway) :

"The Assembly should constantly bear in mind the fact that these are principles the violation of which might produce incalculable effects on the future of the League. The very authority of the League is at stake.

The dispute between China and Japan began in a way which, in the opinion of the Norwegian Government, made it natural to seek a practical solution by mediation between the two Parties,

be more precise. We are satisfied with the interpretation which the President gave just now—it may perhaps have been a personal opinion—and with that interpretation we could accept the text as it stands and will make no objection to its adoption by the Assembly.

Further, when the Assembly voted on the resolution, M. Yen made the following statement : As I read the resolution, and as I understand the President to interpret it, the negotiations mentioned in paragraph 3 refer to armistice negotiations rather than to the so-called Shanghai Conference, which is to follow the armistice negotiations. We accept the resolution on that understanding ; and also with the understanding, which has been so splendidly emphasised by M. Motta and M. Beneš, that no condition should be imposed upon the withdrawal of troops occupying the territory of an invaded country. We consider that Members of the League cannot be expected or asked to pay a price for the enforcement of the right of being protected against foreign aggression, which is a right guaranteed to every Member of the League by the Covenant.

with a constant endeavour to prevent an aggravation of the conflict and the commencement of serious hostilities.

Unfortunately, the conciliatory action of the Council did not produce the desired results. This action has been continued until the last few days, and will, of course, be continued until the conflict has been finally settled. But the present situation is such that it has become necessary to resort to other methods. The Norwegian Government holds it to be of the highest importance that the main lines of the Council's policy should be approved by the Assembly. The Norwegian Government also feels that it would be desirable for the Assembly to adopt certain measures, or possibly to invite the Council to adopt measures, calculated to bring hostilities to a definite end and to prepare the settlement of the whole conflict.

But I feel bound to say that the League's action should not be confined merely to submitting recommendations to the Parties. World public opinion expects it of the League that, if either of the Parties does not accept or respect these recommendations, the League should take appropriate action in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant. I reserve the right, after following the discussion in our Committee, to submit, if necessary, a draft resolution on these lines."

M. Restrepo (Colombia) :

"Possibly the time has not yet come for the League to designate the aggressor and decide whether the territory of a Member of the League has been violated contrary to the provisions of the Covenant in this armed conflict, which the Committee of the Council has already called a state of war. But we should be prepared to do so at any moment, and we must not give the peoples of the world the impression that we are afraid to speak out clearly when the time comes. The future of the League, and consequently of the peace of the world, depends on this.

Negotiations are at present proceeding under the auspices of the League, and with the direct intervention of several Powers, to put an end to hostilities. Let us await the result of these efforts, which do not seem to have failed, and let us thereupon act accordingly.

In the meantime, I wish to offer my fullest support to the statements made by the representatives of France, Spain, Guatemala, Peru and Panama at the meeting of the Council in Paris on December 10th, 1931, statements

embodying more or less explicitly the principles which may be in danger and which form the basis of relations between civilised peoples. These principles are the very expression of the provisions of the Covenant—in particular, Article 10—to which the twelve Members of the Council referred on February 16th, and which I should like to see invoked in all its force when the Manchuria question is dealt with. I would particularly stress, as expressing a necessary consequence of these principles, the passage in the appeal of the Twelve (which is of the same tenor as the very firm declaration made by the State Department at Washington) noting that 'no infringement of the territorial integrity and no change in the political independence of any Member of the League brought about in disregard of Article 10 ought to be recognised as valid and effectual by the Members of the League of Nations.'

The four points formulated on December 10th by M. Gonzalez Prada, representative of Peru on the Council, define the scope of the principles which are in question. For my part, I beg to submit them here for the consideration of my colleagues, in the hope that they may be adopted by all for the purpose of safeguarding the rights of weaker nations, the respect for which undoubtedly enhances the rights of powerful States.

The four points are these :

'(1) No State has the right to effect the military occupation of the territory of another in order to ensure the execution of certain treaties ;

'(2) No State is entitled to oblige another—having invaded its territory—to enter upon direct negotiations on the bearing and legal value of treaties previously existing between the two States ;

'(3) The exercise of the right possessed by each State to ensure the protection of the lives and property of its nationals must be limited by respect for the sovereignty of the other State : no State being entitled, in order to provide such protection, to authorise its military forces to penetrate into the territory of the other for the purpose of carrying out police operations ;

'(4) The fact that a State has certain rights, claims, economic concessions, etc., in regard to another State does not entitle the former to effect the military occupation of the territory or to seize the property of the debtor State. Any recovery of debts by compulsion is illicit, in accordance with the principles accepted by the Second Conference (The Hague, 1907).'

M. Romeo Ortega (Mexico) :

"The foundations on which the League has been built up, and the ideas expressed by the eminent statesmen who, as representatives of their countries, have spoken on many occasions from this platform, are such that Mexico regards the League of Nations as morally capable of guaranteeing the application of principles of justice as against interests which might endeavour by forcible means to ignore or violate them. Confidence in this moral guarantee was the chief reason which led Mexico to form part of this Assembly and to co-operate to the extent of its means in achieving that lofty aim.

In the face of the unfortunate events which have led to the meeting of this Assembly, Mexico regrets that, in spite of the praiseworthy efforts of the Council, hostilities have continued for so long.

Respect for State sovereignty, the inviolability of State territory, the refusal to condone anything in the nature of armed intervention—whatever name is given to it by legal, diplomatic and political artifice—are essential principles for the life of all nations.

Mexico asks that the League should demand entire respect for the provisions of the Covenant and that, apart from geographical and ethnological conditions, it should assert, not as a theory which may or may not be applied, but as an expression of the will of the whole world and as a definite truth, that attacks on sovereignty should not be condoned and that all aggressive intervention should be barred.

The League, in taking such action, will recognise that, in international law, as in private law, no one can take justice into his own hands.

This is of vital importance for the League if it is to gain the respect which is its due. The League is, in the widest sense of the word, the judge, chosen voluntarily and solemnly by the nations."

M. Löfgren (Sweden) :

"The position in the Far East has become worse, and although the news appears to be contradictory, no one can deny that what is taking place is war in everything but name. At this moment I will say nothing as to what has been done by the organs of the League to put an end to this deplorable conflict. I note however, with satisfaction that, from the first phase of the conflict, the Council pointed out that it could not be solved satisfactorily without the withdrawal of the troops concerned. No one can deny, especially after the report by the

Committee of the League at Shanghai dated February 3rd, that the military means employed in the conflict between China and Japan are not in conformity with existing treaties. . . . Without wishing at this moment to give any opinion on the respective claims underlying the conflict, I wish to state that, in the opinion of the Swedish Government, the landing of troops and their use in military operations on the territory of another Power are contrary to the provisions of the Covenant and of the Pact of Paris. Any attempt to extend the conception of legitimate defence in the manner adopted in the present case would render it impossible to maintain any legal international order.

Consequently, my Government unhesitatingly gives its support to the note addressed to Japan by the twelve members of the Council on February 16th last, and, in my opinion, the Assembly should endorse this appeal. I realise the complicated nature of the conflict and the special conditions prevailing in the Far East. These special circumstances cannot, however, be invoked by one of the Parties as an excuse for evading the procedure of conciliation and arbitration laid down in the Covenant.

It is, however, evident that, at the present time, the first duty of the special Assembly is to obtain, not only the cessation of firing, but also the definite cessation of hostilities. The latter is an indispensable condition in order that the organs of the League may contribute to a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Japanese conflict. The cessation of hostilities should, however, take place in such a manner that the position of the Parties to the dispute may not, in view of the settlement of the dispute, be influenced by military pressure and that invasion of Chinese territory may be stopped.

I wish, however, to point out that, once hostilities have ceased, it will naturally be the essential duty of the League to ensure the peaceful settlement of the conflict in the spirit of the Covenant."

M. Erich (Finland) :

"The matter with which we are dealing raises more than one serious problem affecting the very basis of the League. Is the League really a live force and does it constitute a real guarantee? Or, whenever a vital and universal question of security arises, when it is faced with a dispute between world Powers, is it no more than a debating body, passing formal resolutions, or at most a mediatory body, whose real authority and influence depend chiefly on the

goodwill—I will not say the arbitrariness—of the parties concerned?

Shall personal interest and political opportunism be the ultimate principles on which the policy of certain Members of the League is based so that certain Powers, regardless of the engagements into which they have entered, feel justified in acting as they think fit in order to assert their rights, or even to promote their interests, and in resorting, for that purpose, to any means of enforcement and coercion, instead of referring the matter to organisations set up for the purpose of safeguarding peace and settling disputes or facilitating their settlement?

The practice observed by States prior to the League's existence was based on the unlimited power of a State to act as its own interests dictated. But that it is not the system inaugurated by the Covenant. Unfortunately, the Covenant's effectiveness has too often been weakened by a practice based on the principle of following the line of least resistance.

There is, indeed, considerable disharmony between the system of the League, whose political action must be based on the Covenant, and the actual facts—disharmony between the texts, disharmony between the facts. We are sometimes tempted to hide this disharmony, and in exceptional cases a certain amount of illusion may even be useful; reality is sometimes too discouraging. As a general rule, however, it is better to bring out the truth. It is regrettable that the League's power to assert its will is limited: but it is better to recognise its inadequacy than to pretend to observe the Covenant when we are not in a position to do so. Without offending anyone, we might even go a little further and call attention to a method sometimes employed which consists in interpreting some basic provision of the Covenant in a manner which is more skilful than sincere. That is obviously the least satisfactory method of interpretation.

The smaller States know very well wherein resides the League's real motive power and which States are actually responsible for the official interpretation and the real application of the Covenant. It is not to the special interest only of the smaller States, however, it is also their duty, to insist on a just interpretation and a reasonable application of the important principles which have been laid down.

Whenever the League has discussed the various aspects of international security, Finland has always and on every possible occasion insisted on the following principles, and their importance in the matter with which we are dealing must not be overlooked:

1. A clear distinction must be drawn between a threat or even a danger of war, on the one hand, and actual aggression, with or without a declaration of war, on the other. Care must be taken not to confuse a threat with aggression; there has already been confusion of that kind in the League, *inter alia* in the earlier phases of the present affair.

2. A distinction must be drawn between the material causes of a dispute and the aggression to which a dispute may lead if the Parties, or one of them, will not submit to a pacific settlement. Whatever may be the responsibility of either party in regard to the basis of the dispute, the Covenant does not recognise aggression as a direct means for the settlement of a dispute.

3. As early as 1924, Finland put forward and strongly pressed a view which is beginning to be more widely accepted—namely, that the aggression prohibited by Article 10 of the Covenant may occur, without any declaration of war, in the form of hostile acts infringing the territorial integrity and political independence of a country.

Confusion in this matter in political affairs may not justify, but perhaps in some measure explains recourse to coercion without a declaration of war.

We do not suppose that the integral application of the principles of the Covenant can be decided from one day to the next. The present situation is complicated by the events which are occurring and also by the methods which it has hitherto been attempted to employ. However that may be, the Assembly cannot remain passive spectator. It must act. It must do its best in a serious situation, which, however, there is no reason to consider desperate."

M. Beelaerts van Blokland (Netherlands) :

"The events which have occurred in the Far East since September last have everywhere caused the profoundest emotion. After the world war—the war to end war—and the creation of the League we hoped that in future, at least among the Members of the League, we should be spared the horrors of armed conflict.

That has not been the case. Hostilities broke out in China which, by whatever legal term they may be called, have all the main features of war.

From the beginning of the dispute, the League, with the help of the United States of America, has endeavoured to bring about a peaceful settlement of the dispute. The Council has been dealing with the matter for nearly six

months, and the Twelfth Assembly also gave it close attention. Apart from the Parties to the dispute, the Powers were unanimous. Nevertheless, their voice throughout this period has been the voice of one crying in the wilderness. That is perhaps the most disquieting aspect of this tragic affair.

We have been studying the possibility of setting up an international police force, but we must not forget that, even were military action possible, the moral force of the Council's decisions must always remain the pivot of the system, the strongest guarantee of peace, unless the whole organisation of the League is to crumble. In the present case that moral influence has failed. That Party to the dispute which felt it was entitled to take military action continued to do so in spite of the Council's unanimous opinion.

I have no intention, at the present moment, of allocating between the two Parties the responsibility for what has occurred. The dispute has been referred to the Assembly, and in performing its task it will, I am sure, fully appreciate not only its duty to stop the bloodshed in the shortest possible time, but also the fatal effect the League's failure would have on the whole organisation of the international community."

M. Munch (Denmark) :

"We must hope that the outcome of the resolution adopted by the Assembly yesterday evening will be the final cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the Japanese troops.

If, however, that hope is not fulfilled; if there are further operations and fighting on a large scale; if serious hostilities and fighting recommence; if they cannot be terminated by conversations, I see no other way than to apply the system laid down in the Convention we adopted in September, 1931, with a view to strengthening the means for preventing war. Under that system, the Council or the Assembly would be entitled to prescribe a series of measures likely to bring about the cessation of hostilities, and the violation of such measures would involve a presumption that the State violating them was the aggressor.

That Convention, I know, has not been ratified, but it was the outcome of lengthy discussions; it was adopted by the Assembly and its ratification is, I believe, only a question of time.

If, finally, after further efforts at mediation, the conflict were to continue and there was still a danger of war, the League would be obliged

to enforce the procedure laid down in Articles 13 and 15 of the Covenant.

Part of the problems connected with the dispute are, I think, of such a nature that they might suitably be submitted for settlement by a court of law or by arbitration, provided it were found impossible to solve them at a round table conference on the spot. I refer to some, at any rate, of the problems connected with Manchuria; in their case, the question is that of the interpretation and validity of certain conventions. The political problems, on the other hand, should be handled in accordance with the third and fourth paragraphs of Article 15.

If mediation were a complete failure, recourse would inevitably have to be had to a recommendation prescribing a solution in accordance with the third and fourth paragraphs of the article, and the consequences would have to be taken. In this matter, the Covenant is quite clear. It would be impossible not to apply it.

I may add that throughout the conversations we have in mind it will be absolutely essential to uphold two principles which are already laid down in the appeal made by the twelve members of the Council on February 16th.

The first thing to place on record is that a State will not be acting in conformity with the Covenant and the Pact of Paris merely because it avoids declaring war.

What the Covenant and the Pact forbid is not merely a declaration of war, but likewise any act of aggression, any recourse to other than pacific methods as an instrument of national policy.

The second need is a clear affirmation of the principle that, after the establishment of the League as a great international organisation based on law and the adoption of the Pact of Paris, no new right can be created by force, no agreement secured by force can be registered by the Secretariat under Article 18 of the Covenant. That is a *sine qua non* for the validity of any agreement concluded between Members of the League."

M. Motta (Switzerland):

"Article 15 prescribes two procedures which, to my mind, are fundamental. In the first procedure, the Assembly or the Council acts in the capacity of mediator. It is obvious that, with this procedure, the arrangement which it is hoped to achieve can only be brought about with the concurrence of the Parties themselves. I most warmly hope that this first procedure will make it unnecessary to employ the second.

Should the conciliation procedure fail, Article 15 prescribes a procedure by way of recommendations, and, if that procedure results in a recommendation duly voted—that is to say, unanimously in the case of the Council and in that of the Assembly with a specified majority which must, however, include all the Members of the Council—it has certain very important consequences which are described in Article 15, paragraph 6; war may not be made against a State which accepts the recommendation. This sentence, in appearance so simple, is full of the deepest significance. In it, Article 15 foreshadows the application of Article 16.

To my mind, the preliminary condition for the application of the procedure in Article 15 is that hostilities, should they have unfortunately broken out, must cease; the cannon must be muzzled. It would, I think, however, be a very great mistake to suppose that the cessation of hostilities means the solution of the conflict. It is, of course, a very important object, but a secondary one, which will, we hope, be achieved, along with others, by the resolution we adopted yesterday evening unanimously, including the parties to the dispute—a fact which we all welcomed with great satisfaction.

Our principal aim, however, is the maintenance—and, in the special circumstances we are considering, it would be better to say the restoration—of peace between the opposing countries.

Next, let me remind you of a few fundamental principles; and I must apologise for saying less well certain things which have been said with great eloquence and wisdom, and in some cases also very incisively, by earlier speakers.

First and foremost, we must always bear in mind Article 12, which contains a very strict obligation—that of having recourse to arbitration or judicial settlement, or, if this is impossible, to investigation and consideration by the Council.

Until this procedure in Article 12 has been accomplished, and hence until recourse has been had to the Council, all military acts and all acts of war—and the distinction is a rather subtle one—are prohibited. Now, I am afraid that, in this case, Article 12 has not been observed.

Article 15 is the complement of Article 12. It, too, necessarily implies the idea that a country cannot seek justice for itself. The results of the use of force cannot be acknowledged by the League, for the League is based, first and foremost, on the idea of right and on the idea of justice.

True, the Covenant does, in certain cases,

contemplate the possibility of the use even of force; but, as all the countries gathered together here have accepted the Pact of Paris as well as the Covenant of the League, they are prevented from using force even in the case contemplated in the Covenant, because the Pact of Paris forbids all war, all exercise of force, as an instrument of national policy.

Peace is the interest of all. The League is the new juridical symbol of that great idea. If, however, peace is the interest of all, I shall not be going too far if I say that that interest is vital in the case of small countries. Owing to their smaller territory and their inferior economic, military and other resources, the small countries are far more vulnerable than the great Powers, which can in some cases rely on force. Were the small countries to lose their confidence in the procedures laid down in the Covenant, they would be obliged to seek for other methods to ensure the essential and fundamental bases of their security."

M. de Zulueta (Spain):

"The question for the League is—To be, or not to be? We are anxious that the League should act, and we hope that it will do so in the full measure prescribed by the Covenant and with the energy expected by the world.

We have listened with the closest attention to the statements made on different occasions by the Japanese delegate concerning the difficulties with which that country has been faced; but, without prejudging in any way the merits of the problem before us, we consider that the cause of Japan would undoubtedly have gained by being raised from the level of a local conflict in which two isolated countries are at grips with one another to that of an objective problem submitted to friendly discussion before the League of all the nations.

Let us, then, lay down the three following principles:

First of all, we consider that it is the Assembly's duty to itself to proclaim that the Covenant demands that evacuation should precede negotiation. When two countries are in conflict, and if, unhappily, territory has been occupied, it would obviously be incompatible with the Covenant for the occupying country to require that the merits of the dispute should be discussed before its troops had withdrawn from the invaded territory. Hence, both in Manchuria and at Shanghai, it is, in our view, indispensable that, if there are to be negotiations with regard to evacuation, the questions affecting the merits of the dispute must be held over until evacuation has been completed, or

at the least until the principle of evacuation has been agreed upon and a date for its completion formally determined and accepted by both States.

Secondly, we hold that Article 10 is the Magna Charta of the League. Consequently, Spain reaffirms in this Assembly the axiom, enunciated by twelve Members of the Council (including Spain) in an appeal recently sent to the Government of Japan, to the effect that the Members of the League cannot recognise any political or administrative changes brought about by force or in disregard of the principles of the Covenant or the Pact of Paris.

Finally, we must enter a formal reservation with regard to the argument that the obligations of the Covenant may be weakened or relaxed in the case of countries that are inadequately organised. Without putting forward any opinion whatsoever concerning the question whether or no this argument applies to the case before us now, we feel it to be our duty to state as unequivocally as possible that it is principally in the case of the inadequately organised countries, those which are striving to set up a better organisation at home, that it is essential to maintain the international obligations in the Covenant in all their efficacy. The Covenant is particularly necessary owing to the internal weakness of certain countries and the strength of others. The League, which is the organ of the international community, owes it to itself to protect internationally the weak against the encroachments of the strong, and the strong against the chaos of the weak. If, then, there be any conflict due to a lack of internal organisation in certain countries, such cases should, we hold, be considered at Geneva. We could not support the view that, in these instances, there is any right to exceptional or separate action on the part of any State."

M. Tõnisson (Estonia):

"The conflict is not merely one between two Powers. The fundamental principles of international organisation as fixed after the world war are imperilled.

It is not my intention, nor is it within my power, to examine here the underlying causes of the conflict by which, to our keen regret, two Members of the League are divided. My country has always maintained the best relations with both. What I regret is that it should have been thought possible to seek for the solution of this deplorable conflict by the despatch of armed forces and the occupation of a large area of

another State. Such methods should no longer be permissible under the system of the Covenant and of the Pact.

It has, I know, been said that the despatch of troops and the occupation of foreign territory were merely measures of a legitimate defence. Speaking for myself, I cannot accept so wide an interpretation of the concept of legitimate defence. We very sincerely hope that the resolution adopted by the Assembly yesterday will contribute to the effective and final cessation of hostilities between the two parties. The dispute will then have to be settled by the methods laid down in the Covenant and as equitably as possible."

Dr. Beneš (Czechoslovakia):

"Far be it from me in this serious dispute to take sides with either of the opposing parties. I should have no reason to do so, for I am entirely free from all sentimental predispositions or material interests. My country is a sincere friend both of Japan and of China. It has not forgotten the help afforded to it by those two countries at the difficult period of the world war and after the war. Czechoslovakia, in her policy, has maintained close and truly amicable relations with both Japan and China, particularly at Geneva.

Czechoslovakia is concerned in this serious problem solely as a Member of the League of Nations. She is anxious regarding the results of our present action; she desires the League to fulfil all its obligations deriving, not only from the Covenant, but from the moral prestige it at present possesses throughout the world. It desires that the League, which, in spite of all, represents a new spirit and quite a new method in international relations, shall prove that it is useful and, indeed, indispensable to the maintenance of world peace.

M. Paul-Boncour, President of the Council, explained to us, in his eloquent opening speech, the complexity of the question, the peaceful settlement of which we have to consider, and he has emphasised the important fact that we should endeavour to understand the Council's action in the light of the quite special situation in the Far East. I agree with him. At the same time, I should like to emphasise two important points:

(1) China and Japan must be convinced that we are acting in principle towards them as we should act towards any other Power;

(2) That, while bearing in mind the special position from the standpoint of international

law as regards certain political facts in China, certain principles of the Covenant must be respected in all cases and unconditionally.

Having said this, I will define my view as follows:

I. In spite of all the information we have received regarding the origins of the conflict between China and Japan, I cannot claim to know all the circumstances or to be able to judge and accept in advance the arguments for or against, or to be able to mete out blame to either party. Moreover, on looking at the present dispute, I think we cannot entirely disregard certain events, said to have occurred in China, which would seem to be directed against Japan. For instance, the boycott to which reference has been made, but of which no details have been given, would, if it were proved, constitute a hostile procedure which could be complained of to the League. I regret that Japan did not of her own volition lay this matter before the League, as was, and is, her right. Neither public opinion nor the Members of the League could have turned a deaf ear to her complaints.

II. On the other hand, though, under the Covenant, a country possesses the right to ensure its legitimate defence, it has not the right to take justice into its own hands except with the permission of the League. Failing such permission, and faced with action on a large scale and of great political importance undertaken by one of the parties to the dispute in the territory of the other, I cannot help recalling the provisions of Article 10, one of the fundamental articles of the Covenant which I think has been infringed.

III. As a Member of the League of Nations, my country believes it to be necessary that every signatory to the Pact should be obliged in all circumstances to resort to the pacific procedure laid down in Article 12 of the Covenant.

Without referring to other important international acts, this obligation under the Covenant is the one we regard as most precious, the one which, together with Article 10 of the Covenant, should be stressed above all others in connection with this dispute and discussion. If these two provisions of the Covenant are not upheld, the whole edifice of the new international order is threatened.

IV. The fourth point I wish to emphasise is a question of no less importance to the League. For the first time, the Assembly is considering a request submitted to it under Article 15. It is of the highest importance for the League that

we should clearly understand that, by our decisions and the methods we employ, we shall be creating precedents. . . . Finally, this precedent provides us with a lesson. For cases of this kind, the League should possess a perfected machinery and organs of action, its own commissioners and commissions of inquiry and, possibly, its own police force. It is later, however, after the settlement of this serious dispute, that we shall have to deal with this question.

In short, I trust that the League will clearly mark its intention of being just both to Japan and China, that it will, in every case, fully respect the provisions of the Covenant and will remember that we are to-day establishing precedents of a primordial importance for the life and very existence of the League."

M. Politis (Greece) :

"I, like those of my colleagues who have already spoken from this platform, am very anxious to safeguard more specially the two principles which appear to me to be directly involved in this discussion—namely, on the one hand, respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of the nations, and, on the other hand, respect for promises made in international acts.

But I am equally concerned about actual facts; for to overlook facts may empty legal principles of all their substance, reduce them to nothing, and prepare the way, not only for disappointment, but for disaster. That is why I greatly appreciate the work of the League Council in this matter. It has displayed wisdom to which it would be unjust not to pay a public tribute.

As my friend, M. Paul-Boncour, very rightly said in noble and eloquent terms, the Council's great merit is that it immediately put into operation the procedure for which provision is made in the Covenant. Thus it safeguarded the fundamental principles of our organisation. If the Council was unable to do more, that was because it was beyond its power, as it is beyond the Assembly's power, to fill in the gaps in our organisation, to supplement the defects of the system established by the texts.

If the Council had had at its disposal a police force prepared to stand between the opposing armies, hostilities would most probably have been avoided. It is also extremely likely that, had we had a more perfect organisation, the dispute itself would never have taken the turn it did take.

I may perhaps be allowed, as one who looks back regretfully upon work begun but not finished, as one who nevertheless still hopes

that one day that work will be finished, as one who, eight years ago, helped to draft the 1924 Agreement and Protocol, to say frankly and sincerely that, if instead of remaining a pious hope, a milestone on the road ahead of us, the Protocol had come into force, it is more than probable, I think, that, as far as matters in the Far East are concerned, we should not to-day stand where we are.

The Council did what it could in the circumstances. Bearing in mind all the facts, it endeavoured first to restore a peaceful environment in which it would then be able to discharge its duty under Article 15, paragraphs 3 and 4. It began by endeavouring to put an end to the hostilities. Its work was cut short by a request from China to the Assembly. I personally have no complaint to make about that; on the contrary, I think it is a matter for congratulation, because, now the question is before the Assembly, our discussions can assume an amplitude which will bring out more clearly and thoroughly the whole truth and all its consequences.

Now that public opinion, cognisant of the statements made here and those to be made later in the Assembly itself—now, I say, that public opinion is becoming aware of the danger with which it is faced, it will, I am sure, bring its beneficial influence to bear.

I therefore congratulate the Chinese Government on having referred this question to the Assembly. Following upon the Council, the Assembly must, since the Council's work is to be approved, continue that work. Its first duty it endeavoured to fulfil yesterday, and we are all glad that the two parties collaborated. Yesterday, the Assembly prepared the pacific environment in which it can exercise a mediating influence.

If, as we hope, the two objects contemplated in yesterday's resolution—the conclusive cessation of hostilities and the evacuation of Chinese territory—are promptly achieved, the Assembly can then pass to the task assigned to it in Article 15, paragraph 3. It will have to endeavour to reconcile the Parties, to make it possible for them—under the League's auspices—to reach a friendly settlement of the dispute. Only if the negotiations to be opened at the round table conference at Shanghai were to fail, and if subsequently the Assembly's further efforts were unsuccessful, then only would it be necessary to contemplate the application of Article 15, paragraph 4—namely, to make a report containing recommendations to the Parties. But I hope we shall not need paragraph 4; I hope the application of paragraph 3 will suffice to restore peace and concord between

the two nations on the basis of a friendly agreement.

In any event, we must remember that, under Article 12, there is a time-limit to our action. If subsequently it became necessary under Article 15, paragraph 4, to draw up a report containing recommendations, that would have to be done within six months from the date on which the matter was referred to us—namely, if I am not mistaken, by September 3rd next. That fact must be kept in mind.

I think that, apart from the question whether the Council should or should not continue to deal with some part of the matter, the Assembly should continue to deal with the dispute until it is finally settled. As we cannot remain in session for six months, I think you will agree with me that a practical solution would be to appoint a committee to follow the negotiations to be opened at Shanghai, to report to the Assembly, and, should those negotiations unfortunately prove unsuccessful, to make the necessary preparations for the Assembly's future work.

But, I repeat, and on this note I wish to end, I greatly hope we shall not need Article 15, paragraph 4."

Khan Sepahbodi (Persia) :

"The whole East saw in the creation of the League the advent of a new era, in which the nations would co-operate on a basis of justice and equality. That era was to end rivalry between the great States and to protect the weak against unjust attack, humiliation or mutilation by the strong.

The Eastern nations would be immensely disappointed if, now a serious dispute has been referred to it, the League proved ineffectual, merely a feeble voice crying in the wilderness.

As the representative of an original Member of the League, which has been associated in its work from the very beginning, I feel bound to repeat what the representatives of my country have often said. In acceding to the Covenant, Persia was—and still is—firmly convinced that for all the Members of the League the Covenant provides a fundamental law, guaranteeing the peace and security of the nations.

It is our duty to-day to make the fullest use of our fundamental charter, and not to weaken its force by opportunist interpretations. We must restore peace and proclaim to the whole world that the League is not useless."

M. Buero (Uruguay) :

"Yesterday, we enthusiastically approved the Bureau's proposal calling for the withdrawal

of the troops, but did not discuss the conditions which there was some idea of laying down prior to actual withdrawal. The president of the Swiss Confederation rightly pointed out that here there could be no compromise. The principle is absolutely clear, and there can be no question of hedging it round with conditions or even methods which might weaken or nullify its value.

I am not now expressing an improvised opinion. This morning you heard the competent representatives of two American nations, Mexico and Colombia, declare forcefully and courageously that the sovereignty of the nations must not be restricted as regards their territorial jurisdiction. I want, on behalf of a small country in South America, to proclaim that it supports the same principles. I am sure all the States on the other side of the Atlantic will support my contention.

There were lively debates at the Pan-American Conference at Havana in 1928 as to the scope of the principle of absolute non-intervention, a principle supported by the majority of that Conference.

I also attended the 1930 Conference on the Codification of International Law at The Hague, when the same question was raised in connection with the liability of States for damage to the property and person of foreigners. On that occasion, a large majority of States—among whom were all the Latin-American countries—consistently refused to agree to any limitation of the principle of non-intervention, though this was urged by certain great Powers who had in mind the internal situation in certain Far-Eastern countries.

As you see, these precedents point to an unbroken line of conduct, and the Uruguayan delegation cannot remain silent in this important debate.

We also proclaimed our views in the Council of the League in 1923, during a discussion on the same principle between two European countries. I had the honour to represent my country on the committee of jurists appointed to deal with that dispute, and I then expressed the point of view put forward this morning, in particular, by the Mexican and Colombian delegates.

I know we are dealing to-day with a very special situation, but I wonder whether encroachment upon the sovereignty of a State Member of the League can reasonably be justified on the pretext that its internal organisation has not reached a sufficient stage of development. No, if there were any reservations to be made in this connection, they would have been made before that State was admitted to our

community. My reply to the contention that disorganisation and anarchy revealed themselves after its admission to the League would be that the election of such a State to a seat on the Council would not have been justified. The latter circumstance proves the weakness of the argument, and, considering it more carefully, I wonder if anyone could pronounce an opinion with regard to a country's state of development without laying himself open to the charge that his judgment was warped by material interests. Are we sure that our own state of civilisation is the best? Who is the custodian of the standard of development and organisation for the various countries? And if their development could be measured impartially, would that not involve a right of supervision, a disguised right to intervene, as it were?

The solutions we are about to adopt must be examined carefully. It would be most unfortunate if we weakened our organisation by limiting the scope of the undertakings and guarantees embodied in the Covenant. That might cause the League's whole structure to collapse.

There would be no reason for the representatives of the smaller countries to be here, if material interests were to outweigh considerations of justice and legality and respect for the Covenant and the conventions we have signed.

In 1923, the matter was taken out of our hands, because there was then another organisation, which also arose out of the Treaty of Versailles—the Conference of Ambassadors. To-day, we have no pretext for neglecting our duty or concealing our failures. We have perhaps neither the material force nor the ability to apply certain provisions of the Covenant; but that does not absolve us from telling the world exactly what we think about events in the Far East. In 1923, we had to handle our League carefully; it was then a small child, trying its first steps. Nine years have passed, the child has grown, and I think it can withstand the present crisis, even if its actions are not fully effective in practice."

M. Branco (Portugal):

"Nothing could be more painful to my Government than the dispute which, owing to unforeseen complications, has brought two great and friendly nations to arms for the settlement of a dispute that, according to our constitutional laws, should have been settled by pacific means. We still hope—and the earlier proceedings of this Assembly confirm this hope—that the

League's intervention, the efforts of friendly Powers, and the wisdom and respect for treaties that I am sure both Parties must feel, will eventually triumph over the fatal circumstances which led to the outbreak of hostilities. The Portuguese Government most ardently hopes that the chief aim of the League's efforts, the restoration of peace, will be achieved.

Our full co-operation in this noble task, both here and on the spot, we place with sincere goodwill at the Assembly's disposal. We believe that, by indefatigably applying the Covenant, the League will ensure that justice shall be done to the two nations, and in so doing will heighten its own prestige and promote the welfare of mankind."

M. Titulesco (Roumania):

"Japan and China, who now come before us as disputants, are Members of the Council, and hence will be our judges in any conflicts that may arise between us in future. It follows that those views on points of principle which they in their inmost conscience regard as right in respect of their own interests naturally constitute, in their eyes, the law to which we should have to submit on some future occasion when our own interests were involved.

That demonstrates the gravity of the problem and the difficulty of our task.

But there is more. By reason of the circumstances in which this dispute comes before the Assembly to-day, notwithstanding the Council's efforts, which cannot be appreciated too highly, and in consequence of certain acts known to all of us, the conflict between China and Japan is bound up with a still more baffling problem—that of the functions and efficacy of the League as an instrument for the maintenance and development of peace between nations. That is the only standpoint which I shall adopt, since the merits of the problem have not yet been sufficiently studied to enable us to decide without bias in favour of one or other of the disputants.

At the stage we have now reached, it may be frankly said, the question asked by international public opinion, without whose help the League could not fulfil its mission, the question which takes precedence over all others, is whether the League exists or not.

To the problem thus raised, it is the duty of each Member of the League to give a clear and definite reply at this Assembly.

In doing so, we shall be accomplishing, not an act of courage, but rather an act of prudence. The States which are not directly interested in the conflict, but are striving for organised peace as something standing alone, are very like

officers of the law called on to take in due time measures to safeguard future interests, private interests perhaps but nevertheless interests which, in their aggregate, compose the general interest of the world, in which is merged the interest of the League.

To the question put in this way, from the strict standpoint of the League's interest, I, in my capacity of a former President of two League Assemblies, am compelled to reply without any hesitation.

If the League exhausts all the possibilities offered by the Covenant without achieving the desired result it will not only afford proof that it exists, but will also show a vitality which will necessitate an expansion of its constitutional charter, since only the defects of that charter have prevented its success as a peacemaker.

If, on the contrary, the League fumbles, if it fails unequivocally to proclaim the great principles on which its Covenant and modern international life are founded, not only will the League have ceased to exist, but its arduous activity in the past will seem a delusion to those who believed in it.

The Assembly cannot, of course, consider the merits of the question without a preliminary objective study, and probably this will have to be done by a small body which will be appointed by the Assembly itself, and whose work, unless the breach is healed in the meantime, will have to be considered by the Assembly itself, which will then have to draw its conclusions in accordance with Article 15.

The Assembly is, however, even at this stage, in a position to take certain decisions; it is in a position to proclaim, and, in my opinion, it is its duty to proclaim, the principles which should guide any future solution.

There are six of these principles. They are these:

(1) The immediate and final cessation of all hostilities. A decision to this effect the Assembly has already taken in its resolution of March 4th. I should merely like to point out that, in the case before us, it is not a question of the execution of orders which, according to the information we have received, have been given in this matter. The Chinese and Japanese representatives formally told us on March 4th that their Governments had already given the necessary orders for the termination of hostilities.

The question here, therefore, is the execution of a veritable contract between the Parties, solemnly entered into in the presence of the League Assembly.

(2) The need for concluding, as soon as

possible, a military armistice, unaccompanied by political conditions, so as to ensure that the cessation of hostilities will be permanent in order that the negotiations which are about to start will be conducted in an atmosphere of calm and in a spirit which will permit of their success.

(3) Necessity for the complete application of Article 10 of the Covenant. This article, which is the keystone of the League, contains two obligations—that of assisting any Member of the League against foreign aggression, and first and foremost that of respecting the existing territorial integrity of the Members of the League.

May I point out that the Pact of Paris, which forbids war as instrument of national policy and contains a pledge that resort will be had only to pacific means to settle international disputes, thereby entails, for those who have signed it, an obligation identical with that in Article 10 concerning the respect for the existing territorial integrity of each State?

Any weakening with regard to Article 10, any fumbling in its unqualified application, would be a death-blow to the League; whereas, its solemn affirmation by the Assembly at the very moment of our setting out to examine the conflict that has been referred to us would be a salutary act that would immediately remove all the misconceptions which may have misled international public opinion and so have caused it to misjudge the League.

Furthermore, ever since the beginning of the conflict, Japan has stated that she is firmly resolved to respect the territorial integrity of China. The League's task now is to help the two Parties so that we may pass from words to deeds.

(4) Need for protecting Japanese property and subjects.

The League should seek for means to ensure such protection, and those of its Members who enjoy powers conferred on them by their great responsibilities in the political sphere should help the League to put these means into practice, so that the argument which has clouded our discussions may be eliminated once and for all.

(5) Need for basing future negotiations on scrupulous respect for treaties.

When I say respect for treaties, I mean, first, the treaties of peace; the opening articles of those treaties enunciate the rules under which we are meeting to-day. Next, the Pact of Paris under which war has been forbidden as an instrument of national policy; and, lastly, respect for all international pledges, the unilateral denunciation of which is incompatible

with the spirit and letter of the Covenant and with the notion of conventions in general.

(6) Need for the League to affirm a doctrine uniformly applicable to all its Members irrespective of their geographical position.

It has been said that, by aiming at universality, the League has been over-ambitious. That may be so, but I would rather its action should fail because it had encountered, in some parts of the world, certain realities for which it was not created rather than it should fail because it had changed its law to suit special cases and circumstances.

What faith could the nations have in the judge appointed to apply the law if the law was not the law they knew, the law to which they spontaneously submitted, but a law which no one could define; one which chopped and changed according to circumstances that could not be foreseen and over which often there would be no control; a law which, instead of being the precise and clear text that binds us, I mean the Covenant, was, as it inevitably must be, the hybrid result of all the precedents that would have been set up in particular cases as the result of emergency measures?"

M. Zaleski (Poland):

"The conditions accompanying the grave events in the Far East are certainly of a special character, as was pointed out on several occasions during the discussions of the Council on the conflict with which this Assembly has been called upon to deal.

This fact cannot, however, be regarded as absolving the League from the duty of doing all in its power to safeguard peace, in accordance with its most sacred duty under the Covenant. The Covenant imposes upon all Members of the League the duty of respecting the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League.

I may perhaps be allowed at the same time to remind you of the passage in the Preamble to the Covenant in which the reasons which led to the establishment of the League are enumerated and, *inter alia*, the 'firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another.'

Consequently, it is with feelings of satisfaction that we have heard the statement of the Japanese delegate to the effect that his country has no intention of infringing the fundamental obligations arising out of the Covenant.

I hope that our efforts and the goodwill of both parties will enable us to achieve the result which we all desire—namely, that the present difficulties between China and Japan will shortly be settled and that the black clouds which darken the skies of Eastern Asia will be dispersed for ever.

I consider it my duty, however, to point out at this moment, which is so fraught with grave possibilities for the future of the League, that the action of the Council and the Assembly will inevitably meet with serious difficulties so long as the legal rules governing our League are not sufficiently clear and complete.

I need hardly repeat at this stage that my country has always been numbered among the most convinced supporters of the proposals for strengthening the powers at the disposal of the League for the maintenance of peace and the ensuring of respect for the rights of its Members. Poland has warmly supported the plan for mutual assistance and has never ceased to advocate a return to the Geneva Protocol and, during the discussions of the League on the Convention on the Means of Preventing War, she defended the view that there can exist no intermediate state between peace and war. The remarks made on that last occasion, at the beginning of September, 1931, by the representative of the Polish Government on the third Committee of the Assembly are, I think, worthy of attention by my colleagues at the present time. On that occasion, Poland was almost alone in defending that view.

It is perhaps natural that an institution of such recent origin as the League of Nations—for, after all, we are only at the beginning of our task, which is the organisation of the greatest political institution the world has ever seen—should not yet have succeeded in establishing machinery enabling us adequately to settle the relations between the States Members.

As I have already said, I have every hope that, thanks to the goodwill shown by both Parties to the dispute, we shall succeed in bringing the problem before us to a satisfactory issue. We should, however, let the grave difficulties with which we are faced to-day act as a warning for to-morrow, and impel us to undertake without delay or hesitation the necessary work of perfecting our organisation. By making good the gaps in the Covenant and further perfecting its machinery, we shall be working for the organisation of peace and avoiding the possibility of our ever again finding ourselves in such a serious and difficult position."

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom):

"We are deeply conscious that the situation

which we have before us involves something more even than the restoration of peaceful conditions in the Far East. It involves nothing less than the utility, in the case of a major dispute, of the League of Nations.

Our meeting together here and the course of this discussion are a demonstration that we all of us are of one mind in recognising the importance and desiring the maintenance of the fundamental principles of the League.

So much, Mr. President, by way of preface, for it is in that spirit that I, on behalf of my Government, desire to make a few remarks on the practical procedure which seems appropriate for the immediate purpose of our general discussion.

I begin by recalling and emphasising an observation of His Excellency M. Motta, who pointed out on Saturday that the first duty which is cast upon this Assembly in relation to the dispute that is before it is the duty of mediation. Article 15, in its third paragraph, expressly provides for this, and it is of the first importance that we should all keep the contemplated procedure strictly in mind, as M. Motta has expounded it.

We should be abandoning our first duty if we did not persist in pursuing this procedure of conciliation by every means in our power; and I associate myself most warmly with those who have preceded me—M. Motta and other speakers—in expressing my ardent hope that that procedure, which we must not abandon or regard in these first few days of our work as already exhausted, may be pursued to a successful issue by such appropriate procedure as the Assembly may see fit to adopt.

But there is a second aspect of our present duty to which I wish to direct particular attention, and which I think might very well be expressed in a declaration which every Member of the League here present should be willing to endorse without delay. I do not, of course, mean that we can pronounce a judgment on matters which are in controversy. It would be contrary to the first principles of justice that, at a time when an investigation is proceeding with the help of a Commission appointed by the League which has only just reached the Far East, when we have not received, as I understand, the full statement of the case of both Parties, when each side unfortunately makes allegations against the other which are in dispute, it would, I say, be contrary to the first principles of justice to do anything of the kind. But, none the less, there is a very important

declaration which, without waiting for the full ascertainment of matters in controversy, the Assembly might, if it so willed—and, as it seems to me, properly should—make forthwith, and I will venture to indicate for the consideration of my colleagues the general nature of the declaration I have in mind.

I have spoken of the distinction between pronouncing a premature judgment on matters in controversy and of a declaration of another sort which may fitly be made now. No one has put that distinction with more clearness than M. Beneš in his speech on Saturday—M. Beneš, whose constant interest and long experience in the work of the League is known to us all—and M. Titulesco, who spoke with his great authority and long connection with the League, made a very similar statement this afternoon. Let me quote two sentences from the speech of M. Beneš. He said on Saturday, in respect of the information secured on the substance of the dispute between China and Japan, that he did not claim to know it all; that he did not claim to be able to judge between the Parties or to be able to accept beforehand the arguments *pro* or *contra*. M. Beneš rightly emphasised the complexity of the Far-Eastern situation and the difficulty, without exact information and close study, of appreciating what he quite rightly called the special situation existing in the Far East. With all that I agree; but the pronouncement which the Assembly might make now would not, I think, be in conflict with M. Beneš' reservation. What I have in mind is not a pronouncement as to the merits of the controversy between these two Members of the League, but as to the measures by which the solution of that controversy should be sought—for, mark you, this is the first time that the Assembly has been concerned with an appeal addressed to it under Article 15, and it is therefore of the first importance, having regard to the future, that we should not prejudice the opinion of the Assembly in future cases by prejudging the merits of a controversy which is under investigation, but that we should reaffirm what the proper methods of dealing with such a controversy are. Natural justice, the *jus naturale* of Roman law which has become the common inheritance of all who seek to do justice in any controversy, no doubt requires us to hold our judgment on the merits in suspense during the investigation which is taking place. But I would appeal to everyone here. I would appeal to our honourable colleague the representative of China, to our honourable colleague, the representative of Japan, I would appeal to the representatives of other States, whether small or great. Should

not we take this opportunity now solemnly to reaffirm the fundamental principles on which the League is based, and by which every signatory represented in this room is bound? Should we not declare afresh that the Covenant does not authorise a State, however well founded its grievances against another State, to seek redress by methods other than the pacific methods set forth in Article 12 of the Covenant? Should we not make reference afresh to the Pact of Paris which, together with the Covenant, is one of the pillars of the peace organisation of the world? It provides, as M. Titulesco, pointed out an hour ago, under Article 2, that 'the High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be which may arise among them should never be sought save by pacific means.'

Should not we make reference therefore to Article 10 of the Covenant? By it all Members of the League have undertaken to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. These propositions, therefore, are propositions which every Member of the League is bound to accept without regard to the merits of the controversy and to all those complicated matters. Changes brought about not as the result of methods of conciliation and peaceful adjustment, but by means contrary to the Covenant and the Pact of Paris manifestly could not receive the approval of Members of the assembly of nations, which exists for the very purpose of observing these obligations and these principles. Such are the general lines of the declaration which I would invite my colleagues here to join in formulating.

Now what should such a declaration accomplish? Well, it would reassert the conditions under which every Member of the League is pledged to conduct relations with every other Member in a way which would, I trust, receive the adherence of every State here represented. It would direct the attention of the world once more—the fresh and specific attention of the world—to the proper means of solving disputes. It would be a proclamation not only of the interest but of the duty of us all to stand by the League in this hour of its severest trial. I agree with what was said from this tribune a short time ago by a previous speaker. It would be far better for the League to proclaim its principles, even though it failed to get them observed, than to forsake those principles by meaningless compromise."

M. Rosso (Italy):

"The speaker who preceded me on this platform, Sir John Simon, suggested a solemn declaration by the Assembly confirming the staunch adherence of all Members of the League to the fundamental principles of the Covenant. I hasten to say that I fully appreciate the value and importance of such a declaration.

Having said this, I should now like to lay before you the views of the Italian delegation with regard to the practical duty that devolves upon this Assembly. I say practical duty, because I think we are all agreed—we cannot but agree—upon the object to be pursued. It only remains for us to agree on the methods to be employed to achieve this object.

On this point I can only repeat what the Greek delegate, M. Politis, said last Saturday when he told us that we must keep in mind not only principles but also practical realities; he said that if we overlook the real facts of the situation, we may empty law of its substance and reduce it to nil, and that may bring both disappointment and disaster in its train.

What must the Assembly do to take account of the realities of the position? In the opinion of the Italian delegation, it must, in the first place, employ all means to effect the settlement of the dispute in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 15. It seems to us that, despite all, the Assembly will be giving proof of political wisdom if it does not evade its duty of carrying out, with all the authority at its disposal, the conciliatory and mediatory action provided for in Article 15, paragraph 3.

This action comprises successive stages. The first stage has already been indicated by the resolution adopted by the Assembly at its third meeting, on March 4th, when it set itself to solve without delay the most urgent problem—namely, how to render possible an arrangement entailing the final concession of hostilities.

The second stage may be marked by the execution of a plan submitted to the Council by its President at the meeting of February 29th, with a view to the re-establishment of peace in the district of Shanghai. This plan entails the calling of a conference at Shanghai to act on behalf of the League. Such a conference would have the advantage of acting on the spot, and consequently being better able to judge of the situation and to find the most practicable and equitable solutions.

Finally, we must not, I think, forget that a Commission appointed by the Council on the basis of Article 11 of the Covenant is already on the spot, and has been instructed to study

the substance of the question and to suggest the means best calculated to eliminate the underlying causes of the difficulties which have brought about the present state of affairs.

This is a programme of action which, in my opinion, offers a very good chance of bringing about a settlement of the dispute. By adopting it and supervising its execution by the most suitable means, the Assembly would in no way be foregoing its right to apply any other measures subsequently in the event of the execution of this programme encountering obstacles—a contingency which we ought not to expect in face of the loyal co-operation of the Parties to the dispute.

If I am not mistaken, this was the view expressed by M. Politis when he advocated the appointment of a commission to follow all the negotiations at Shanghai and to report to the Assembly. The Italian delegation highly appreciated the value of this suggestion and would for its part, be ready to subscribe to it.

In conclusion, I will sum up the views of the Italian delegation by saying that it regards the duty of the Assembly as clearly indicated in the procedure laid down successively in the paragraphs of Article 15 of the Covenant. It is the right and duty of the Assembly to follow this procedure by taking, without precipitation but with firmness, all the measures involved and at each stage utilising to the full the various means at its disposal. The Italian delegation considers that the three prerequisites of success are: firmness in its words, calmness in its decisions and consistency in the application of those decisions."

M. Von Weizsäcker (Germany):

"From the discussions in this Commission one general idea seems to emerge. The dispute between China and Japan has lasted too long and has assumed proportions such that it has ceased to be a purely local conflict.

The incidents that have taken place in China have brought the League face to face with its main problem—the problem of the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. The task devolving upon the League was to ensure the execution of the provisions of the Covenant for safeguarding peace, and I need not emphasise the fundamental importance of this present test.

The League was created to maintain and ensure peace. The very reason for its existence would disappear were it to fail in the performance of the imperative duty laid upon it. My country, which was one of the first to accede to the Kellogg Pact and which opened the way to disarmament through a very considerable reduction in its armaments, is greatly concerned in

ensuring the triumph of the principle of the just and equitable solution of international disputes by pacific methods. That is the principle which should be maintained and asserted in any decision, in any measure and in any resolution that may be decided upon by this Assembly.

Discussion, which has not been lacking in criticism, seems, moreover, to have served a very useful purpose. Over and above the problem now before us, it has provided us with information of a general character for the future. It has, above all, shown us the necessity of possessing means of preventing international conflicts—a principle which, as you are aware, the German representatives have continually urged during the last few years: 'Prevention is better than cure.' Nothing is more difficult than to try to settle incidents in a depressing atmosphere of suspicion and uneasiness.

I should also like to bring out one characteristic fact in the exchanges of views that has just taken place, and that is the frankness of the discussion to which we have been listening. A few weeks ago we heard the delegates to the Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments proclaiming that it was the duty of the Conference to achieve positive results. The Special Assembly is in precisely the same position as the Conference convened by the League: it must succeed. It is not enough to entertain a systematic optimism, a failing with which we have often—and rightly—been reproached. It is best to be frank and not to entertain illusions, but to face the facts as they are and deduce the logical consequences. That is the proper way to work; that is the method which should prevail in any collective activity, in any international organisation.

Having stressed that point, I desire now strongly to support the proposals put forward by the British representative, to the effect that the general discussion should be brought to a close by the adoption of a declaration on the general principles of the Covenant and of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. Should circumstances place any obstacle in the way of the full realisation of those principles, I think, like certain other speakers who have preceded me here, and in conformity with statements made by the German representative on the Council, that it would be better frankly to recognise a setback than to content ourselves once again with a purely formal solution."

M. Paul-Boncour (France):

"As representative of France, I should like to say that my country is prepared to associate itself with any resolutions or any measures that

the Assembly may deem most suitable for the settlement of the present conflict and to maintain and ensure respect for the provisions of the Covenant. My country has placed all its trust in the Covenant. It has based the whole of its foreign policy on respect for the terms of the Covenant. The actual proposals which my country has drawn up and is defending in discussions elsewhere—the success of which is largely determined by the ultimate success of our efforts here—are based on respect for the terms of the Covenant and on their reinforcement. You will then realise with what satisfaction France has heard so many nations, great and small, proclaim the confidence they place in the Covenant as regards their security and their territorial integrity. France feels she may interpret these declarations as a recognition, at least implicit, of the necessity—I repeat what the Greek representative said, in terms which were both elegant and precise—of perfecting the equipment and machinery of the League. As representative of France, therefore, I may say that I rejoice to find that so many of the declarations that were made expressed my own views and those of my country. As President of the Council—for, do what I will, I cannot wholly dissociate that capacity from the other—I rejoice to find, in these discussions, a judgment of the Council's efforts which seemed to me friendly and appreciative. I am not, I think, mistaken in deducing, though there were shades of difference, and indeed diversity, in the modes of expression—and these form the actual value and interest of the discussions we have just held—that the nations represented here have approved the Council's work. Nor did I hear any suggestions made other than those on which the Council has hitherto based its action. This agreement cannot but strengthen the Council's hands very appreciably.

Just before the Assembly met, the Council had reached a positive result which, though still inadequate, was at least appreciable. It had secured the acceptance by both Parties—subject to a reservation to which I shall refer—of a cessation of hostilities in the Shanghai region. The Shanghai Conference, which constituted the essential point of what has been called the Council's plan, was made expressly conditional on the cessation of hostilities. The necessary solutions and the various details had obviously to be decided by the Conference, but the Council has already laid down the main lines. They are these: respect by Japan for the territorial integrity of China, and recognition by China of the maintenance of the International Settlement and the French Concession. That plan, which was conditional on the cessation of hostilities,

was accepted by both Parties, subject to the express and very natural reservation on the part of China that the Conference could not be held until hostilities had actually ceased. It was in these circumstances that the Assembly opened; and despite the conflicting reports which necessarily arise when, on a long and broken battle-front, where orders cannot get through everywhere at the same time, skirmishes and individual actions continue, it was clear to us that the main battle which had been raging for several days around Shanghai had ended. The Assembly—I say the Assembly because, at the judicious suggestion of the President, the decision adopted by the General Commission was immediately converted into a decision of the Assembly—intended to second the Council's decision, and has done so by inviting the two Governments, in a recommendation of March 4th, to ensure the effective execution of the orders given for the cessation of hostilities.

Our unanimous feeling is surely that the Assembly's first effort, its most immediate duty, must be to bring about an armistice to safeguard us against a resumption of hostilities, which will remain imminent so long as the actual and material cessation of hostilities has not been made permanent, so long as no armistice has been concluded laying down the conditions and time-limits for evacuation. Until the armistice has been concluded, we shall not have the pacification we need.

I quite realise that this only settles the Shanghai question; I note, like Sir John Simon, from the Council's previous resolutions, and particularly that of December 10th, which was accepted by both Parties, that it is materially impossible for us to pronounce on the part of the dispute relating to Manchuria until we have information which can only be given us by the Commission sent to the spot. I think, however—again in agreement with Sir John Simon—that, though our procedure in this respect hinges upon the receipt of information which we have not yet got, there is, on the other hand, nothing to prevent us now from making a declaration recapitulating the principles underlying the League's action. I am thinking more particularly of respect for Article 10, which my colleague and friend, M. Titulesco, rightly described as one of the corner-stones of the Covenant.

The confirmation of the Council's action, on the one hand, and the affirmation of the League's principles, on the other, are the bases on which, in my view, a resolution can be drawn up which could be adopted by the Assembly. A committee might be set up, as has been suggested, to follow events. But

I do not think it is the view of anyone, and particularly of those who initiated the proposal, that the Assembly's authority can be manifested simply by the creation of a committee. The Assembly must adopt fundamental resolutions; the committee will outlast the Assembly, will remain in being when the Assembly is not actually present, but will be based on principles which the Assembly will lay down in a declaration—a precise categorical affirmation of the view of the Assembly, which is the highest emanation of the League."

M. Garay (Panama) :

"In his opening speech, the President of the Council, M. Paul-Boncour, outlined in masterly fashion a striking portrayal of the sequence of events in which the resolutions adopted by the Council in application both of Article 11 and of Article 15 of the Covenant are admirably summarised and commented upon.

I only propose at present to mention the Paris resolution of December 10th, in connection with which I felt bound, as I have said, to make certain statements. The Paris resolutions allowed one of the Parties to the dispute to take steps of a military nature in the foreign territory occupied by it, with a view to ensuring the protection of the lives and property of its nationals against the attacks of local bandits. That was the condition imposed for the acceptance of this resolution, which would have had no legal value if it had not been adopted unanimously. It was a purely practical expedient not intended to create a precedent; for the Covenant, our paramount law, does not recognise the doctrine of qualifying circumstances on which our resolution was inevitably based. That is the origin of all the reservations and declarations made thereafter.

For my part, I desired to safeguard the following three principles:

1. The principle of non-intervention, without, however, affecting the intervention of the League between States Members signatories of the Covenant, or interventions defined by treaties *inter partes*.

2. The principle of the territorial sovereignty of the State as a limit or barrier imposed on the exercise of the right of nations to protect their nationals in other countries.

3. The principle of the peaceful settlement of all international disputes which the Covenant makes obligatory for all Members of the League (Article 12).

After hearing this declaration and the much more important declarations which had preceded it, the then representative of China, Dr. Sze,

pointed out that the application of the treaties and principles recognised by international law could not totally disappear at the frontiers of Manchuria. We never claimed that they should. But we did earnestly desire the immediate restoration of peace in the Far East, and the Council resolution as proposed seemed to us to be the sole way of securing this result. This hope was not fulfilled, but that was not due to any failure to act or any lack of a spirit of conciliation on our part.

There can be no doubt that neither party is a colony, protectorate or mandated territory, and that both are absolutely entitled to the protection of international law. Not only do we admit this fact, but we add—thereby signifying our agreement with some of our colleagues in the Assembly—that the Covenant recognises no varying degrees of sovereignty and independence as among Members of the League.

At the time when the Council appealed to Japan not to give effect to her Shanghai ultimatum, I renewed at Geneva, at the public meeting of February 19th, the reservations I had made at Paris, and these reservations will be maintained as long as the situation in the Far East continues to be in flagrant contradiction with the doctrines of the Covenant and the prevailing principles of law. In so doing, I am not animated by the slightest partiality towards either of the Parties, but solely by a great hope in the future of the League, which might ultimately—we must remember—become the actual victim of the deplorable events that have brought us together here in Geneva.

Violence in international relations does far more harm to the world nowadays than was formerly the case. Formerly, it was no one's concern but the country whose rights and interests were directly involved and which defended itself as best it could. But since the League has come into existence, the situation is no longer the same; such acts directly concern the League, which was created for the very purpose of preventing and punishing them."

Mr. Lester (Irish Free State) :

"The fateful issue which is before this Assembly therefore imposes a duty and a grave responsibility upon every Member of the League, whether representing a small or a large State. In the words of the Spanish Foreign Minister, the issue may well be whether or not the basic principle of our new international relations will continue to exist.

The matter is of great importance, because of

the fact that the dispute of which the Assembly is now seized is the whole dispute between China and Japan, not the incidents of that dispute, whether they are taking place, or have taken place, in Manchuria or Shanghai, but the trouble itself of which those incidents are the unhappy symptoms.

Certain considerations of principle seem to stand out from the mass of facts before the Assembly. Firstly, there is a duty clearly imposed upon every party to the Covenant to avail itself fully of the machinery of the League for the settlement of all disputes. The obligations of the Covenant in this respect are powerfully reinforced by the provisions of the Pact of Paris.

Secondly, the territorial integrity and political independence of every Member of the League are guaranteed in the plainest possible terms by Article 10 of the Covenant. This Assembly has to consider whether the conduct of either of the Parties to the dispute constitutes a violation of this all-important article.

Should it be found that the Covenant has, in fact, been violated, it would become our clear duty to declare again the solemn principles upon which the public law of the world is now based and to require of the party concerned a definite rectification of the situation.

In this relation, it may not be out of place to direct your attention once more to the note sent to Japan on February 16th by all the Members of the Council, exclusive of the two Parties to the dispute, and in regard to which the honourable delegate of Sweden has made a useful suggestion.

It is clear that the duty of the Assembly is not only to settle the dispute between two Members of the League, but also and above all to uphold the sanctity of the Covenant.

The first step is therefore to restore a situation compatible with the Covenant, not only by the cessation of hostilities, but by the restoration of the *status quo ante*.

The final settlement, which may take a long time to reach, can only take place on the basis of respect for international agreements, the Covenant, the Nine-Power Treaty and the Peace Pact of Paris. We must not only settle this dispute: we must settle it right."

.
M. Paredes (Salvador):
.

"I should like to draw the Commission's attention to one very important point: Article 10 of the 1924 Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes gives the following definition of aggression:

'Every State which resorts to war in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant or in the present Protocol. . . .'

I think the words 'force and violence' should be substituted for the word 'war.'

If it is the general idea underlying the Covenant and the Protocol that force and violence as well are to be condemned, it would be desirable, in order to avoid misinterpretations, to insert these words, the importance of which cannot be overlooked. That would prevent the recurrence of the very regrettable case of two Powers committing acts which by their nature really constitute war while declaring, in order to evade the responsibility that might result from such acts, that they have not resorted to war.

Unless the word 'war' is replaced by the phrase 'force and violence,' a strong nation might take possession of the entire territory of another and then declare it had not had resort to war.

Article 10 of the Covenant, which guarantees territorial integrity, would in that case be difficult to apply, because we should be faced with a *fait accompli* due to the violation of the principle, a sufficiently grave and quite inadmissible act.

.
It would be desirable that the League should enunciate once again the principles upon which it is founded. They may be summarised as follows:

- (1) Respect for treaties, without which international life is impossible.
- (2) Inviolability of a State's territory, and, as a logical corollary, a declaration of the principle of non-intervention, whether for the recovery of debts or for the protection of the lives and interests of nationals of the invading country, or for any other reason—except, of course, in the case of interventions recognised by the Covenant.
- (3) Absolute prohibition of States taking the execution of justice into their own hands.

I fervently hope that the conflict engaging our attention may be settled in conformity with the principles of justice, and that the League will secure respect for the Covenant, and the whole Covenant, for it is the fundamental charter of the new international organisation."

.
Count Apponyi (Hungary):
.

"Although the country I represent has no direct interest in the development of that conflict—we entertain nevertheless the same feelings of respect and sympathy for both the

nations so unhappily divided—I will venture, perhaps for that very reason, but also from a feeling of duty, to occupy your attention for a few moments.

I am speaking, I have said, from a sense of duty. Let me explain what I mean, since my words might be held to imply too much. The Assembly, it might be considered, could very well dispense with the feeble help which I can give it in this matter.

The discussions in the League Assembly in these latter years contain, however, certain precedents, certain controversies have arisen in the course of its debates, and I have sometimes found it necessary to examine the League's decisions in a critical spirit; for these reasons, silence on my part might be taken to mean abstention, lack of interest or a refusal to take part in an act which it is intended shall promote the realisation of the League's ideal. I should be sorry if any such misconception arose. It is because I follow the path mapped out by the lofty ideal underlying the Covenant, because I adhere to the methods enjoined in it and in the other conventions devised to serve the same purpose, that I desire to state that we will loyally and unreservedly co-operate in this Assembly and in any decisions it may take.

The League's credit would be enormously increased if in this difficult matter we could obtain a real result, and, first of all, the cessation of hostilities, for which, in my opinion, we have had to wait rather long. I shall therefore wholeheartedly support any proposals made with a view to ensuring that our influence is speedily felt at this preliminary stage. I shall in particular support Sir John Simon's suggestion that we should take special resolutions with this end in view. I hope to see his proposal in writing and I shall give it my enthusiastic adherence.

Such confidence as we can inspire would be materially enhanced if we could achieve this object, not only a pacific solution of the present emergency, but, following on that solution, a prospect of unravelling by pacific agreement—and that will probably require work uninterrupted by episodes like this—the tangled skein of major interests that is bound up with the Sino-Japanese question.

A result of that kind, brought about with the assent of the two great peoples directly concerned and, in a manner, in keeping with the legitimate interests and rights based on previous treaties, would be an immense success.

If we continue in the spirit in which the discussion has, to my great satisfaction, gone forward—for we have heard several delegations that have often been opposed to one another

come forward and proclaim identical principles with the same warm and sincere devotion—if we continue on this path, I have strong hopes of our success.

No human institution can ever enjoy absolute certainty that it will always be successful. Just as there are certain diseases that defy science and all the efforts of the greatest physician without detracting from the physician's credit, so the League may be faced with an explosion of organic forces with which, in the present position of affairs, it will be unable to cope. That does not mean that we should not proceed in the hope that mankind will develop in a manner that will render feasible what appears impossible to-day. That will not reflect discredit on the League, because, while we cannot absolutely expect complete success for all human endeavour, we can at least demand that human endeavour, whether individual or collective, shall discharge its duty to the full and make every exertion to secure success.

Notwithstanding the difficulties of the problem on which it is now engaged, the League must always remain itself. That is a simple axiom, but it contains, I think, the whole truth.

The League of course cannot, and should not, be the instrument of the individual policy of any single Power or group of Powers. It should be exclusively an organ devised to foster the high ideal expressed in the introduction to the Covenant, and to do so by the methods prescribed in the articles of the Covenant.

That is the straight road before us. If we keep to and continue along it, while making all due allowance for the legitimate pride of the two great nations concerned in the conflict, but at the same time loyally and firmly resolved to go to the uttermost limit, then, whatever happens, the League's credit can only be enhanced in the eyes of all those whose opinion matters.

I say that merely to complete the picture, but let me repeat, if we can keep to this straight road on which we have set out, if we can obtain, at all stages of our proceedings, the unanimity that has been shown in this Commission, we shall then have endowed the League with an incalculable moral force which, supported by that of the United States of America, will really and truly represent the conscience of all mankind. No one, I think, could resist the pressure of so great a moral force."

M. Mayard (Haiti) :

"We ardently hope that, to deal with the conflict in Asia, the General Commission will propose that the plenary Assembly adopt a

decision so drafted as to revive in the minds of the peoples a vigorous and active confidence in the fundamental idea which gave birth to the League. We trust that the decision will do away, so far as the activities of the League and its terminology are concerned, with all those subtle discriminations which are concealed by such disquieting euphemisms as 'unorganised States,' 'States with limited interests,' 'regional understandings,' 'special situation of a continent' and so on. All these are phrases which ordinarily are employed only to justify in advance the misuse of force, and are applied to facts which represent a denial of the principles of justice, equality and mutual assistance, the very foundations and substance of the Covenant.

The Haitian delegation unreservedly associates itself with the categorical and precise opinions expressed by the delegates of Mexico, Uruguay, Panama and Salvador. We associate ourselves still more categorically and enthusiastically with the declaration of the Colombian delegate, M. Restrepo; and, like him, we ask the General Commission to recommend the Special Assembly to embody in the judgments and resolutions which it will ultimately pass with regard to the dispute brought before it the following four points which were formulated by M. Gonzalez-Prada, the Peruvian representative on the Council, on December 10th :

Sir George Perley (Canada) :

"During the last twelve years the world has been endeavouring to build up, through the League, a system of outlawing war and settling disputes by reason rather than by force. The way in which this Assembly deals with the question before it will go far to show how successful we have been in this effort. Certainly, if the Assembly meets satisfactorily the test which now confronts it, it will mean a long step forward in the realisation of the League ideal.

To the Canadian delegation it seems that the work of the Assembly must be based primarily upon the following considerations :

- (1) We should stop further bloodshed and bring about a real and effective armistice.
- (2) We should distinguish between the rights of a case and the manner in which those rights are realised and enforced.
- (3) We should affirm as solemnly as possible the fundamental truth that no infringement of the territorial integrity, and no change in the political independence, of any Member of the League of Nations which is brought about by force in disregard of the undertakings of Article 10 of the Covenant can be recognised

as valid and effective by the other Members of the League.

We believe that this Assembly, the instrument through which the common concern of mankind for the maintenance of peace can find expression and make itself felt, should proceed in its work with the above considerations always in view. We hope that by so doing it will arrive at a solution of the difficulties before it, which will be just, peaceful and permanent."

M. Batoloff (Bulgaria) :

"The problem concerns not only the States Parties to the dispute; its moral and legal effects are of vital importance to all States Members of the League. It raises questions of principle of the utmost importance. We must consolidate and safeguard the development of the new era in international relations inaugurated after the world war. That is to say, we must replace force by law. The solution of all conflicts must be sought by pacific means. Under the Covenant and the Pact of Paris justice must not be sought through violence. In the same way, no *fait accompli* policy could be acceptable to public opinion.

One of the fundamental articles of the Covenant, Article 10, guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence of all Members of the League. In the present conflict, therefore, the principle of the inviolability of the national territory must be safeguarded. It is important, in the interests of peace, that the Covenant and the Pact of Paris alike should be respected by all the signatories.

The League is now creating a precedent which is of great importance to the future, for the issue is the maintenance unimpaired of the confidence the nations have placed in the League, and the strengthening of its authority and prestige."

M. Mazuranic (Yugoslavia) :

"My country wishes to speak during the present discussion, not in order to bring forward new opinions or to open out new horizons, but to state its profound conviction that Article 11 of the Covenant embodies not merely a method of procedure but a pure truth. The article stipulates : 'Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League.' We also desire to join those who have emphasised that this time the League, in seeking an adequate solution of the problem, must exhaust every effort and, above all, must avoid anything

which might disguise the real nature of the question. What the Council, in spite of its good intentions, has been unable to do will in no case constitute a precedent. But, now the problem is before the Assembly, it has entered into its final phase. We are discussing the matter under Article 15 of the Covenant. Any decisions we take will constitute a precedent, and will be of considerable importance. They may perhaps influence a whole historical era. I would go further, and would say that, in any event, our decision must not be an *ad hoc* decision, but must be universal and binding upon all Members of the League.

I would go even further and say that the representatives of the States directly concerned in the problem must be sure that our decision is universal and binding upon all. I need not, I think, dwell further upon the importance of our decision.

The sudden vicissitudes of modern history, the torrent of political events, demonstrate very clearly that the maxim *hodie mihi cras tibi*—though we should say *hodie tibi cras mihi*—is still true in international life.

I warmly support the Czechoslovak representative's statement, particularly his observation that the examination of the problem now before us will perhaps disclose certain weak spots in our organisation.

May I venture to draw attention to one of them? Is it not regrettable that the League is dependent, for the necessary information, upon the goodwill of the States which happen to be in a position to furnish it? However friendly and willing those States may be, I think it essential that the League should be able to obtain the necessary information through its own organisation.

The problem is very complex, and as the late M. Briand—then President of the Council—said on December 10th last: 'this problem . . . is of a very special character, because of the exceptional nature of the treaty or customary relations existing in normal times between the two countries.'

The problem is so difficult and complicated that it may be beyond the League's power to find an adequate solution. That should not discourage us, but should, on the contrary, incite us to improve our organisation; for the latter is so essential to all the Members of the League."

Mr. de Water (South Africa):

"It therefore behoves every signatory nation to the Covenant to form its judgment on the facts of the case as they have been presented to us by the Parties to the dispute. It is for this

reason that I speak briefly and, I hope, without circumlocution.

But let me say this at once, that it is not possible for my delegation to form a just judgment on the facts at the present moment, in the sense that it is at this moment not able to allocate the blame to one Party or the other to this dispute, for all the facts of the dispute between China and Japan are not yet known; although this I am able to say bluntly, that we have no other name for the state of affairs in China to-day than that of war, and the following facts at any rate appear to be clear to us.

Powerful Japanese forces, equipped with all the modern weapons of war, have been transported into Chinese territory. These armies have been actively and destructively used against Chinese forces and have taken possession of a considerable portion of Chinese territory. It appears to us equally clear that Japan has not sought to use the pacific means at its disposal under the Covenant, to which it is signatory. Nor, in the absence of any further explanation by Japan, does it appear to us that in this dispute she has remembered her declarations under the Pact of Paris. Equally it seems to my delegation an undisputed fact that China has placed its case in the hands of the League and has been prepared at every stage of the inquiry by the Council of the League to act on its advice and instructions. As emphatically has Japan refused to show the same confidence in the fairmindedness of a body of which it has been for many years so active and important a Member.

As far as these facts are concerned, it is to be stated unhesitatingly, in our opinion, that a *prima facie* case has been made out that Japan has acted in contradiction to what we believe to be the obligations to which, equally with all of us, she is bound.

Yet so far, and no further, is it possible for me to form a clear opinion.

I, for one, would urge the distinguished representatives of Japan to state to this Commission of the Assembly, in the clearest terms, its full case on these points to which I have drawn attention. Japan may have the most profound reasons why she has not been able to use the machinery of the League, or why she has not been able to follow its advice. I can only urge again that we be given these reasons, for it seems to me to be the simple duty of this Assembly to ascertain the validity of those reasons.

Let me say this. My country stands back to no nation in its deep regret at the unhappy relations which exist between these two great Eastern peoples to-day. An unsettled Asia has,

and has had, the most far-reaching economic repercussions in the world.

It has always seemed to us a tragic and fateful fact that China has now for many years been unable to compose her own internal differences. Such a composition, were it to come in the near future, would bring in its train reactions which, it will be agreed by every thinking man, must ultimately spell the greatest benefit to herself as well as to the nations of the world. But that wealthy country's weakness has never seemed to us to be a good reason why advantage should be taken of her weakness by any one of the great Powers of the world.

As for Japan, I am one of those who have always had, and still have, the utmost admiration for those great qualities of virility, intellectuality, courage and patriotism which characterise her people in their national life. It is because of the abundance of those qualities possessed by Japan's distinguished representatives at this Conference that I appeal to them, on behalf of my country, to use their great prestige to persuade the Government of their country to turn from measures of war to pacific means to compose this dangerous dispute. It is because Japan possesses those qualities in such abundance that it seems to me unthinkable that she will not pause and take stock. It seems to me unthinkable that, by the course she chooses to pursue, she will finally decide to cast on one side the friendship and admiration of so many nations, and the good opinion of the world.

Thus far I have spoken briefly of the actions and responsibilities that rest upon the two Parties to the dispute. But what of ourselves? How far are we prepared to recognise the grave responsibilities and duties which a crisis such as this places upon every State Member of the League?

I had occasion at another time and in another place to remark that it appeared to me just and seemly that the voice of a nation should be heard at these Conference tables in the advocacy of a policy, in proportion to its share in the sacrifice such policy may entail.

For that reason, the smaller nations at a conference such as this should look to the Great Powers for a lead. For theirs must be the chief sacrifice.

We, at this great crisis in our affairs, are looking for wise leadership from the Great Powers and, above all, for strong leadership—leadership which can be interpreted in terms of action and not in terms of words.

Are the Great Powers satisfied that they have pointed the way?

The Aga Khan (India) :

"Mediation is the first duty laid upon this Assembly by the terms of the Covenant. It is true that the Covenant prescribes other courses of action to be followed as circumstances develop, but, if we are faithfully to perform our first duty of friendly mediation, we must not let ourselves be deflected by thoughts of any other duties that may later devolve upon us.

If we do not concentrate with a single mind upon mediation, we shall not only be prejudging the issues; we shall fall into a far greater error. No mediator can hope to succeed unless he set himself to win and hold the confidence of both Parties. He may too easily forfeit their confidence if he allows himself to be influenced by the knowledge that he may later have to form other conclusions. Yet if once the Parties lose confidence in him, he will not only have failed completely in his first duty, but will have raised formidable obstacles in the path of further progress.

Therefore I would urge the Assembly not only to concentrate on its first and vital immediate task of mediation, but to hold fast to the principles which alone can guarantee its success.

Is it too much to ask that the two Parties on their side should co-operate by placing themselves freely in the hands of the mediators, confident that the mediation will be carried out in a spirit of complete fairness and impartiality for the permanent peace and friendship of the Far East?

India hopes earnestly that mediation will be but the first step towards true friendship between China and Japan. To achieve its aim, mediation must be based, not on methods of expediency, but on clear guiding principles. Where else are we to seek these principles but in the Covenant itself, which is the mainspring of all our efforts here? All the signatories have fully weighed and understood the obligations which it lays on them; but that fact is perhaps not sufficiently appreciated. Let us make it clear beyond dispute to the world as well as to ourselves. I gladly support the suggestion made by the representative of Great Britain that we should seize the opportunity to reaffirm in all their bearings the fundamental principles that underlie the Covenant. If that suggestion can win united support, we shall lay a sure foundation on which an edifice of lasting peace, friendship and co-operation in the Far East can be constructed."

M. Feldmans (Latvia) :

"The Latvian nation has followed with great anxiety the development of the events we are

discussing. Even if we admit the extreme complexity of the problem and of the causes underlying the dispute, we must nevertheless also admit that the events have extended dangerously beyond the limits which the international undertakings, the Covenant and the Pact of Paris lay down with regard to the reciprocal relations of the nations.

We have seen an economic boycott, the failure of one of the Parties to execute treaties, hostile propaganda, and, finally, resort to force, the refusal to submit the question to pacific procedure. In a word, in this dispute, all the ills we believed had been finally banished from international life have reappeared.

The Latvian nation, which has very small material forces and has based its future on respect for international undertakings and faith in the vital power of the principles of justice and equity, of which the League is the guardian, views this with serious disquietude.

At this grave moment, the Latvian delegation strongly urges the two great disputant nations to lend us their aid in establishing peace, and assuaging the anxiety of the nations.

It is our duty to restore and strengthen their confidence in the League.

The Latvian delegation does not consider it desirable, at this moment, to examine the root causes of the dispute or to pronounce a hasty judgment against either Party. In our opinion, the League Assembly is chiefly a political instrument, whose primary duty is to restore and organise peace.

We are glad hostilities have ceased ; but the nations expect more of us than that. We must convince them that this special Assembly has won a victory for the fundamental laws of our charter. We must be able to tell them that both nations, equally desirous of serving the cause of peace, have freely accepted solemn undertakings which will absolutely prevent any recurrence of the recent unhappy events.

The League must not give up the question until it is finally settled."

M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia) :

" The delegates of Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay and Salvador have generously, forcefully and enthusiastically reminded us of the principles which Latin America has always been the first to champion. Formerly, these principles existed only in the universal conscience. They are now embodied in the Covenant. All we ask is their strict observance, because therein resides the guarantee of our own future and existence. That alone will enable us, the younger, smaller, weaker countries to achieve our real destiny, as

other nations have achieved theirs before us. Only we will not, cannot, and must not employ those methods by means of which, in the past, many nations were able to expand. Times have changed.

The Chinese and Japanese delegates can hardly forget that every voice raised here, however humble, however weak, is speaking on behalf of the universal conscience and the brotherhood of mankind. The magnificent demonstration of fellowship from this platform, therefore, has made of it a living centre of spiritual force and truth.

But it is not enough to lay down the principles. We must apply them. On whom shall this heavy burden be placed ?

The Covenant confers benefits, and it also imposes duties. For their accomplishment, certain material means which some of us have and of which others are deprived are necessary.

Obviously, despite the moral equality of States, their material capacity is graduated. There is a close connection between this fact and the principles of the League."

Resolution of March 11th.

At the end of the discussion on March 8th, after further statements by M. Yen and M. Sato, the General Commission, on the proposal of Dr. Beneš, instructed a Drafting Committee to prepare a draft resolution which would take account of the views set forth before the Commission and of draft resolutions already deposited by various delegations, or to be deposited before midday on March 9th.

The Draft Committee was composed of the members of the Bureau and of representatives of States having presented draft resolutions.*

Under the presidency of M. Hymans, the Committee, after an exchange of views, instructed two Sub-Committees to prepare a resolution in two parts, of which the first was to summarise the principles embodied in the various drafts, the second the procedure to be followed by the Assembly for the settlement of the dispute.

The first Sub-Committee was composed as follows : M. Politis (Greece), Baron Ramel (Sweden), Sir John Simon (British Empire), M. de Zulueta (Spain). The second : M. Beneš (Czechoslovakia), M. Erich (Finland), M. Huber (Switzerland), M. Paul-Boncour (France), M. Pilotti (Italy), M. Restrepo (Colombia).

On March 10th the Drafting Committee

* Draft resolutions were deposited by the British, Colombian, Spanish, Estonian, Finnish, Greek, Norwegian, Salvador, Swedish, Swiss and Czechoslovak delegations.

completed its text, which was immediately communicated to the delegations. On March 11th, the General Commission considered the resolution. At this meeting M. Sato made an important statement, containing the following passages :

"The Japanese Government is entirely in agreement with the fundamental principles set forth in the resolution, and, as it has stated on many occasions, its conduct will be guided by those principles. . . . She particularly regrets the allegation that the action she was compelled to take in China was an attack upon the present political independence or territorial integrity of another country, or was an attempt to exercise military pressure for the pursuit of any object whatsoever.

"... Japan has no territorial designs in China. . . . The Japanese Government is sincerely desirous of achieving rapidly a friendly settlement of the present situation.

With regard to the text of the draft resolution, the Japanese Government is particularly glad that attention has been called to the principle of scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations. . . . One of the most important factors in the present situation in the Far East is undoubtedly the systematic attacks on legitimate rights and interests guaranteed by treaty, and China's policy of unilaterally denouncing the most solemn undertakings. . . . Another factor in the present state of affairs is the anti-foreign agitation and the boycott, an economic and political weapon, to which China has resorted in pursuit of her national aims. . . .

The Japanese Government also notes with satisfaction that the draft resolution mentions the Council resolutions of September 30th and December 10th. Since the present incidents began, Japan has followed the Council's procedure with goodwill. . . . In virtue of Article 11, she proposed that a commission of inquiry should be sent to the Far East to obtain the necessary information for settling the whole matter. This procedure is still in progress; the Commission is still at work. You will remember that, at the Council's last meetings on January 29th and 30th, the Japanese delegation raised objections to the application of Article 15 to the whole Sino-Japanese conflict, in view of the proceedings to which I have just referred.

The Japanese Government's attitude is, I hope, now clear. It has itself stated its views in its reply to the appeal of the twelve Members of the Council. As I have just said, Japan took part in this Assembly, subject to certain reservations with regard to the applicability of Article 15. In view of this fact, we cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution. In these circumstances, the Japanese delegation will simply refrain from voting, in order not to oppose the adoption of the resolution."

After this statement, the vote was taken by a show of hands and the resolution was adopted.

The Assembly, summoned immediately after the meeting of the General Commission, was requested by its President to take its decision by roll call. Of the forty-seven delegations

present, forty-five voted in favour of the resolution; two (China and Japan) abstained.

M. Yen said that he had not yet received instructions from his Government. In accordance with Article 19, paragraph 5 of the rules of procedure of the Assembly, the President declared the resolution to be unanimously adopted. The resolution reads as follows :

" I.

"The Assembly,

"Considering that the provisions of the Covenant are entirely applicable to the present dispute, more particularly as regards :

"(1) The principle of a scrupulous respect for treaties ;

"(2) The undertaking entered into by Members of the League of Nations to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all the Members of the League ;

"(3) Their obligation to submit any dispute which may arise between them to procedures for peaceful settlement ;

"Adopting the principles laid down by the acting President of the Council, M. Briand, in his declaration of December 10th, 1931 ;

"Recalling the fact that twelve Members of the Council again invoked those principles in their appeal to the Japanese Government on February 16th, 1932, when they declared 'that no infringement of the territorial integrity and no change in the political independence of any Member of the League brought about in disregard of Article 10 of the Covenant ought to be recognised as valid and effectual by Members of the League of Nations' ;

"Considering that the principles governing international relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes between Members of the League above referred to are in full harmony with the Pact of Paris, which is one of the corner-stones of the peace organisation of the world and under Article 2 of which 'the High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature and whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means' ;

"Pending the steps which it may ultimately take for the settlement of the dispute which has been referred to it ;

"Proclaims the binding nature of the principles and provisions referred to above and declares that it is incumbent upon the Members of the League of Nations not to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League of Nations or to the Pact of Paris.

" II.

"The Assembly,

"Affirming that it is contrary to the spirit of the Covenant that the settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute should be sought under the stress of military pressure on the part of either Party ;

"Recalls the resolutions adopted by the Council on September 30th and on December 10th, 1931, in agreement with the Parties ;

"Recalls also its own resolution of March 4th, 1932, adopted in agreement with the Parties, with a view to the definitive cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the Japanese forces; notes that the Powers Members of the League of Nations having special interests in the Shanghai Settlements are prepared to give every assistance to this end, and requests those Powers, if necessary, to co-operate in maintaining order in the evacuated zone.

" III.

"The Assembly,

"In view of the request formulated on January 29th by the Chinese Government invoking the application to the dispute of the procedure provided for in Article 15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations;

"In view of the request formulated on February 12th by the Chinese Government that the dispute should be referred to the Assembly in conformity with Article 15, paragraph 9, of the Covenant and in view of the Council's decision of February 19th;

"Considering that the whole of the dispute which forms the subject of the Chinese Government's request is referred to it and that it is under an obligation to apply the procedure of conciliation provided for in paragraph 3 of Article 15 of the Covenant and, if necessary, the procedure in regard to recommendations provided for in paragraph 4 of the same article;

"Decides to set up a Committee of nineteen members—namely, the President of the Assembly, who will act as Chairman of the Committee, the Members of the Council other than the Parties to the dispute and six other Members to be elected by secret ballot.

"This Committee, exercising its functions on behalf of and under the supervision of the Assembly, shall be instructed:

"(1) To report as soon as possible on the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of arrangements which shall render definitive the said cessation and shall regulate the withdrawal of the Japanese forces in conformity with the Assembly resolution of March 4th, 1932;

"(2) To follow the execution of the resolutions adopted by the Council on September 30th and December 10th, 1931;

"(3) To endeavour to prepare the settlement of the dispute in agreement with the Parties, in accordance with Article 15, paragraph 3, of the Covenant, and to submit a statement to the Assembly;

"(4) To propose, if necessary, that the Assembly submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice a request for an advisory opinion;

"(5) To prepare, if need be, the draft of the report provided for in Article 15, paragraph 4, of the Covenant;

"(6) To propose any urgent measure which may appear necessary;

"(7) To submit a first progress report to the Assembly as soon as possible and at latest on May 1st, 1932.

"The Assembly requests the Council to communicate to the Committee, together with any observations it may have to make, any docu-

mentation that it may think fit to transmit to the Assembly.

"The Assembly shall remain in session and its President may convene it as soon as he may deem this necessary."

Committee of Nineteen.

The Assembly constituted a Committee of nineteen members which, in accordance with Chapter III. of the resolution, is composed of the President of the Assembly, the Members of the Council other than the Parties to the dispute, and six members elected by secret ballot. The countries elected were Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Colombia, Portugal, Hungary and Sweden.

Adjournment of the Assembly.

The President then pronounced the adjournment of the Assembly till later, saying that he would summon the Committee of Nineteen for the first days of the following week.

Chinese Acceptance of the resolution of March 11th.

On March 12th M. Yen informed the President of the Assembly that his Government had accepted the resolution adopted on March 11th.

"My Government is gratified that practically all the principles of importance, for which it has contended since the very inception of the Sino-Japanese dispute, have been incorporated in the resolution of March 11th. My Government desires to refer in particular to three of these principles:

1. That the settlement of the dispute should not be sought under the stress of military coercion which it takes to mean that the evacuation of Japanese troops must precede negotiation.

2. That it is the obligation of members of the League to submit any dispute which may arise among them to procedures for peaceful settlement, which absolves the Republic of China from all responsibility for the present terrible state of affairs in Manchuria, Shanghai, and other parts of China, and

3. That it is incumbent upon the members of the League of Nations not to recognise any situation, etc., brought about contrary to the Covenant of the League or the Pact of Paris. The word "situation" must, of course, cover the present state of things created in Manchuria through Japanese manipulation, instigation and military support—in particular to the puppet Government in Manchuria."

Communication from the United States Government.

The United States Minister at Berne, to whom the resolution had been communicated, replied as follows on March 12th:

"I am instructed by my Government to express to you its gratification at the action taken by the Assembly of the League of Nations. My Government is especially gratified that the nations of the world are united on a policy not to recognise

the validity of results attained in violation of the treaties in question. This is a distinct contribution to international law and offers a constructive basis for peace.

You suggest that I note particularly Part II of the resolution. In this the Assembly recalls several resolutions, and cites especially its own resolution of March 4th, 1932, adopted in agreement with the parties with a view to the definitive cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the Japanese forces. My Government as one of the Powers which have special interests in the Shanghai Settlement has already authorised its representatives at Shanghai to assist in co-operation with the representatives of other Powers similarly situated toward the consummation of those objectives."

Meeting of the Committee of Nineteen.

The Special Committee of Nineteen constituted under the resolution of March 11th held its first meeting on March 16th, under the chairmanship of M. Paul Hymans. There were further present M. von Weizsäcker (Germany), Lord Londonderry (British Empire), M. de Zulueta (Spain), M. Paul-Boncour (France), M. Matos (Guatemala), Count Apponyi (Hungary), Mr. Lester (Irish Free State), M. Pilotti (Italy), M. Colban (Norway), M. Garay (Panama), M. Barreto (Peru), M. Zaleski (Poland), M. de Quevedo (Portugal), Baron Ramel (Sweden), M. Motta (Switzerland), Dr. Beneš (Czechoslovakia), M. Choumenkovitch (Yugoslavia).

After hearing a statement by the President on information he had received concerning the situation in the Far East, the Committee decided to meet the next day in public to hear the Chinese and Japanese representatives.

On March 17th, M. Hymans recalled that the Committee was instructed to report as soon as possible on the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of arrangements at Shanghai. Having learned that negotiations were in progress between the Parties, he invited the Chinese and Japanese representatives to give the Committee any information at their disposal.

M. Sato said that his Government had ordered forces of 14,000 men to return to Japan. He confirmed that preliminary negotiations with a view to the conclusion of an armistice had begun on March 14th at Shanghai; it had been understood that complete secrecy would be maintained in regard to these negotiations in order that their success might not be imperilled.

M. Yen explained that on March 14th the Chinese Assistant Foreign Minister had conferred at Shanghai with the Japanese Minister, in the presence of the British, American, and French Ministers and the Italian Consul General. Subject to the approval of the Chinese and Japanese Governments, a provisional arrange-

ment had been established on the following basis:

1. The Chinese troops were to remain in their positions pending a later settlement.

2. The Japanese troops were to withdraw to the International Settlement and the extra-Settlement roads (situation as before January 28th). It was understood, however, that, in view of the number of Japanese troops, some would have to be temporarily stationed in localities adjacent to the above-mentioned areas.

3. The joint Commission of neutral members was to certify to the mutual withdrawal.

The Chinese delegate added that this agenda was accompanied by a separate note and a Japanese proposal for the amendment of paragraph 3, which the Chinese Government considered as inadmissible. The separate note is as follows:

"The parties are agreed as to the following arrangement: provided a final agreement is reached on the basis of the above points, the Chinese authorities voluntarily give an independent undertaking that the letter of January 28th from Mayor Wu shall stand."

The amendment proposed to paragraph 3 instructed the joint Commission to "watch and observe the general conditions in the evacuated area pending a later settlement."

M. Yen recalled that, in his letter of January 28th, the Mayor of Shanghai had agreed, after receiving an ultimatum, to take steps to stop the boycott of Japanese goods. The question involved in the separate note was, therefore, of a political character and should not be raised in reference to the armistice negotiations.

The Chinese delegate added that his Government objected to the amendment to paragraph 3 because the Commission proposed by the Japanese Minister would not be a neutral commission and because the Chinese Government could not agree that an invader of Chinese territory should be permitted to return and act as a party in controlling conditions in the region evacuated.

The President explained that, to his mind, the amendment did not differ essentially from paragraph 3 of the original text of the basis of the agreement; it did not seem to be in contradiction with the Assembly resolution of March 4th. As for the separate note, it concerned a letter sent on January 28th by the Mayor of Shanghai in reply to a Japanese ultimatum demanding an effective control of the anti-Japanese movement and the dissolution of anti-Japanese organisations. The Mayor had accepted the Japanese demands in their entirety.

The Japanese Government, concluded the President, was now asking for that letter to be maintained. If the Japanese Government intended only to make a proposal, the Chinese Government was free to reject it. If the Japanese Government intended to lay down a condition, the condition in question would be of a political character and therefore contrary to the resolution of March 4th.

After statements by Dr. Beneš and M. Paul-Boncour, who agreed with the President, M. Sato denied that Japan was responsible for the delay in the Shanghai negotiations. He expressed his satisfaction at the opinion expressed by the President in regard to the amendment of paragraph 3. As regards the separate note, while emphasising the importance attached by Japan to the cessation of the boycott, he stated that his Government would not make the conclusion of the armistice conditional upon negotiations in this connection. He would, however, raise this problem before the Shanghai Conference contemplated under the Council's plan of February 29th. In conclusion, he asked several questions regarding the work of the Committee.

After a statement by M. Motta, the President noted that agreement existed both as regards the amendment to paragraph 3 and the separate note. Japan, realising that she would have every opportunity of discussing the boycott question at the Shanghai Conference, would agree to the adjournment of this question, which the Committee considered as being of a political character.

The Chinese representative accepted the amendment to paragraph 3, as interpreted by the President. As regards boycotting, he declared that the Shanghai Conference had to confine itself to discussing the security of the life and property of foreign nationals in the Settlements. If it were stated that the question of boycotting would be dealt with at Shanghai, this would convey the impression that the Conference had been summoned to deal with this, which was not the case. Boycotting existed not only at Shanghai, but in the whole of China.

The President replied that the Committee did not intend to discuss the boycott question, which the Shanghai Conference would be at liberty to consider. Defining the rôle of the Committee of Nineteen, he said: "Our Committee, appointed by the Assembly, has to supervise the execution of the Assembly resolutions. It is not for our Committee to dictate armistice terms; these terms must be negotiated on the spot by the Parties, with the assistance of the Powers with direct interests at

Shanghai. The rôle of the Committee is to secure the observance of the spirit and letter of the Assembly resolutions and, in this connection, to reply to any appeal that may be addressed to it."

At the end of the meeting, M. Paul Hymans announced that the Committee would be able to disperse for the Easter recess. As President, he would remain in touch with the Secretary-General for the transmission of information from China and Japan, would consider what immediate measures should be taken if minor incidents arose, and would immediately summon the Committee at Geneva if the situation became worse. In the afternoon of March 17th, the Committee held a private meeting to consider proposals of the Chinese delegate concerning the execution of the Assembly resolutions of March 4th and 11th. It decided to invite the Chinese and Japanese Governments to inform it of the steps they had taken or intended to take in the near future to give effect to the resolutions adopted by the Council on September 30th and December 10th, 1931. On March 18th, the Secretary-General addressed to the Chinese and Japanese representatives a note to this effect. On the same day, the Secretary-General, at the request of the President of the Committee of Nineteen, wrote to the Acting President of the Council stating that the Committee attached considerable importance to receiving, at the earliest moment that the Council might find possible, any reports that might reach it from the Commission appointed under its resolution of December 10th, 1931.

The President of the Council informed Sir Eric Drummond that he had immediately forwarded this letter to the Members of the Council, as well as to the Commission of Inquiry.

(b) COMMISSION OF INQUIRY IN THE FAR EAST.

The Commission of Inquiry over which Lord Lytton is presiding arrived in Japan on February 19th, staying there until March 11th—the greater part of the time in Tokio.

During its stay it was able, through interviews with the Foreign Minister, the War Minister, the Minister of the Marine, leaders of the business world and of circles especially interested in relations between Japan and the League, to make itself acquainted with Japanese public opinion on the principal points to be dealt with in its inquiry.

The Commission then proceeded to Osaka where it discussed the situation with the more prominent business men.

Arriving at Shanghai on March 4th, the

Commission left that city on March 26th for Nanking; at the end of the first week of April it proceeded to Peking and will arrive in Manchuria at the beginning of the third week of the month.

At Shanghai the Commission established relations with numerous Chinese and foreign representatives of political, university, religious

and commercial circles. It heard their opinion with regard to the principal aspects of the Sino-Japanese relations and established official contact with the representatives of the National Chinese Government. The Commission conferred with the Vice-President of the Yuan Executive and the Assistant Foreign Minister.

III.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The six Commissions appointed by the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments (General, Political, Land, Naval, Air and National Defence Expenditure) remained in session at Geneva until March 18th. Their work, which will be resumed on April 11th, was partially interrupted by the extraordinary session of the Assembly.

* * *

At the end of February the Conference Bureau had instructed Dr. Beneš, Vice-President of the Conference and Rapporteur of the General Commission, to prepare a co-ordinating table of the draft Convention and of the propositions referred to the General Commission, as well as a list of the questions that might be referred to the Commissions for examination. These documents were examined by the Bureau, and after a consultation of delegations, both the table and the list of questions were adopted by the General Commission on March 8th.

In the course of the exchanges of views which took place on this occasion, Dr. Beneš pointed out that the lists of questions were not restrictive and that delegations would be free to submit new amendments and proposals. Moreover, owing to the complexity and political bearing of the questions, it was probable that the discussion would sometimes have to be interrupted, and that from time to time it would be necessary to seek the advice of the special commissions which, in their turn, would ask the General Commission for explanations or decisions of principle.

In this way the Air Commission brought before the General Commission the question of the internationalisation of civil aviation in connection with that of the abolition or reduction and limitation of military aviation.

On March 16th the General Commission adopted a resolution stating that "without prejudicing the decision of principle which the General Commission will be called upon to take on the question, a previous technical study of its possibilities and the methods of carrying it into effect would be likely to facilitate greatly

the said decision." Considering this study desirable in connection with the decisions to be taken concerning the abolition or reduction and limitation of military aviation, the General Commission requested the Air Commission to undertake it, and to submit to it any conclusion as regards detail that it might think likely to assist it in forming an opinion either with regard to the internationalisation of civil aviation or with regard to any other measure calculated to prevent signatories from using this aviation for military purposes. The General Commission authorised the Air Commission to obtain the assistance of the competent international bodies if necessary.

As regards the work of the special commissions, the Political Commission decided on March 15th, at the request of M. Szumlakowski (Poland) to set up a Sub-Commission to study the problem of moral disarmament. This Sub-Commission appointed M. Perrier (Switzerland) to the chair and M. Szumlakowski as rapporteur. On March 16th it instructed a small Committee (the Chairman, the Rapporteur, M. de Brouckère (Belgium), Mrs. Corbett Ashby (Great Britain) and Count Apponyi (Hungary)) to prepare a list of the questions to be examined and make proposals as to the order in which they should be taken.

The Land Commission appointed General Laidoner (Estonia) and M. Van Lanschot (Netherlands) Vice-Chairmen, and M. Bourquin (Belgium) rapporteur. It began by discussing the manner in which various Governments had interpreted the term "effectives" in their replies to the League on the position of their armaments and the way in which they had calculated their average effectives. A Committee of experts presided over by M. van Lanschot was instructed to consider how the Governments, when compiling their information, had interpreted the definitions given in Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the draft Convention.

The Naval Commission appointed as Vice-Chairmen M. Dupré (Canada) and Tevfik Bey (Turkey), and as rapporteur M. Westman (Sweden). It examined and approved Articles 17, 20 and 21 of the draft Convention, and

began its examination of Article 18, which relates to the rules for the replacing of war vessels. As regards the definition of naval effectives, a small committee was instructed to prepare a questionnaire. In a report, which the General Commission noted, the Chairman, M. Colban (Norway), set forth the points in regard to which the General Commission would have to proceed to a preliminary discussion.

The Air Commission appointed as Vice-Chairmen M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia) and M. Marinoff (Bulgaria), and as rapporteur M. Boheman (Sweden). Its principal subject of discussion was the internationalisation of civil aviation.

After the General Commission had decided that a preliminary study should be made of the possibilities and methods of giving effect to this proposal, the Air Commission instructed its bureau to prepare, if necessary with the help of the Secretariat and competent international organisations, an objective documentary study summarising the principal work of the International Organisations and the official proposals of delegations with regard to any other measure calculated to prevent the signatory States from using this aviation for military purposes. The bureau was also instructed to prepare a study on the organisation of national civil aviation, and a programme for the resumption of the work of the Air Commission.

The Commission on National Defence Expenditure appointed as Vice-Chairmen M. Valdes-Mendeville (Chile) and M. Radulesco (Roumania), and as rapporteur M. François (Netherlands). As a basis of its work it adopted

the report of the Committee of Experts on Budget Questions and drew up its programme of work. It instructed a technical Committee (M. Radulesco (Roumania), Chairman; M. Arakawa (Japan), M. Grobine (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics), M. Jacomet (France), M. Kissling (Switzerland), M. Lyon (Great Britain), M. Modzelewski (Poland), M. Sandler (Sweden), M. Norman H. Davis (United States), M. Tumedei (Italy), M. Rodriguez de Vasconcellos (Brazil) and M. Worbs (Germany)) to study the information furnished by Governments on their national defence expenditure. Delegations were invited to give this Committee supplementary information, in particular on the budget system in force in their countries, by replying to a questionnaire prepared by the Committee.

Before dispersing, the General Commission, on the proposal of Mr. Gibson (United States), decided that, when resuming its work on April 11th, either it or the Political Commission would sit continuously until such time as sufficient progress had been made in respect of decisions on questions of principle to allow the special commissions fruitfully to pursue their labours.

The General Commission approved a proposal of its Chairman that delegations which had submitted proposals during the general discussion should, if possible before April 4th, communicate memoranda containing detailed explanations with regard to these proposals, as well as plans for carrying them out. A circular to this effect was sent to delegations by the Chairman on March 17th.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

Session of the Financial Committee.

The Financial Committee held a session in Paris from March 3rd to March 24th. It considered the financial situation of Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary and Greece, and prepared a report for the Council in which its members, in their capacity as independent experts, drew the Council's attention to the gravity of the situation and the urgent need of remedying it. In this connection, certain concrete proposals were submitted.*

V.—OBITUARY.

I. DEATH OF M. BRIAND.

The news of the death of M. Briand, early in the afternoon of Monday, March 7th, was

announced by the President of the Extraordinary Assembly in the course of the debate in the General Commission. M. Hymans said :

" I have a painful duty to perform. We have just learned some unexpected and overwhelming news, which will cause you, as it has caused me,

* This report will be analysed in the next number of the *Monthly Summary*.

the deepest emotion. M. Briand has just died in Paris.

He was the splendid embodiment of the idea of peace and international *rapprochement*. He was one of the most powerful workers in the service of the League. His voice, his accents, still echo in our ears. We see him before us. We loved him. We admired him.

He was one of the glories of France. He was one of the most illustrious of orators. His name will ever be coupled with the loftiest of man's ideals, and it will live in history.

We offer the French delegation, whose unbounded grief we well understand, our deepest condolence.

I propose that, as a sign of mourning, the Assembly should adjourn for a quarter of an hour."

M. Paul-Boncour thanked the President on behalf of his Government, observing that it was a tragic coincidence that this grievous news should arrive during a meeting of the Assembly for the settlement of a dispute to which M. Briand had devoted the last months of his life. M. Briand, he said, had gone without witnessing the achievement of his desires, either in this particular matter or in the organisation of peace in general.

On the same day the President of the Assembly sent M. Tardieu, the French Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, the following telegram :

"The Assembly of the League of Nations has been deeply moved by the sudden passing of M. Aristide Briand, and on its behalf I offer Your Excellency my deepest condolences on the loss which has been sustained by the Government of the Republic and the whole of France. The Assembly shares your grief and will faithfully and gratefully cherish the memory of the illustrious statesman who was so passionately devoted to the cause of peace and gave to it all his strength, his heart and his great eloquence."

M. Tardieu replied as follows :

"I am deeply touched by the condolences you have been good enough to offer me on behalf of the Assembly of the League of Nations upon the death of the illustrious statesman whose passing is so grievous a loss to the Government of the Republic and whose name stood for the pacific ideal of France and her faith in the civilising mission of the League. On behalf of the French Government, I beg you to receive and to convey to the Assembly my thanks for the messages you were good enough to transmit to me."

* * *

The Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments also paid a solemn tribute to the memory of M. Briand.

At the meeting of the General Commission on March 8th, the Chairman, Mr. Henderson, said that the cause of peace had suffered a great loss. During the work of the Conference, the spirit of M. Briand would be continually present. The Conference had been summoned by the

Council under his presidency, and M. Briand had signed the invitations to the Governments represented. The delegations might best honour the memory of M. Briand by bringing the Conference to a final and complete success.

M. Paul-Boncour thanked Mr. Henderson on behalf of his Government, recalling the importance which M. Briand attached to the Conference, on whose success depended, to a great extent, the maintenance of world peace.

M. Paul Hymans and the Secretary-General left for Paris to represent the Assembly at M. Briand's funeral. M. Paul-Boncour was deputed by the Council to attend the ceremony.

Mr. Henderson, who was also to have gone to Paris, was unable to do so on account of his health.

* * *

The Polish Foreign Minister, M. Zaleski, wrote to the Secretary-General on March 20th stating that his Government would be willing to contribute ten thousand Swiss francs to the founding of an Aristide Briand scholarship at the Geneva International School.

2. DEATH OF COLONEL DE REYNIER.

On March 30th, Colonel de Reynier, Chairman of the Commission appointed by the Council to study the question of the Iraq-Syria frontier, met his death in an airplane accident near Rubba, while travelling from Beyrouth to Bagdad to join the other members of the Commission.

The remains of Colonel de Reynier, conveyed by the members of the Commission, were transported by air to Damascus, arriving on March 31st. Military honours were rendered, and a religious service held in the presence of the High Commissioner for Syria and the Lebanon. The remains were then transported to Beyrouth.

The British and French Governments addressed to the Secretary-General the following telegrams :

"His Majesty's Government are deeply shocked to learn of the tragic death of Colonel de Reynier, President of the Iraq-Syria Frontier Commission, and I am instructing His Majesty's Minister at Berne to communicate their condolences to Swiss Government—Simon."

"I have heard with great grief of the tragic accident in which Colonel James de Reynier lost his life. In paying a last tribute to the competence and impartiality constantly shown by the Colonel in the accomplishment of his successive missions, which finally brought him to the presidency of the Siro-Iraqi Frontier Commission, the Government of the Republic begs you to receive and forward its sincerest condolences to the members of the Council—Tardieu."

Colonel James de Reynier (Swiss) was born in 1870. During the war he acted as Director of the *Société suisse de Surveillance* in Paris. From 1921 to 1925 he was President of the Danzig Harbour Board; afterwards he held office as Saar Records Commissioner, member of the Greco-Bulgarian Emigration Commission and, quite recently, was appointed to the presidency of the Commission on the Iraq-Syria frontier.

3. DEATH OF M. SOKAL.

M. François Sokal, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of Poland to the League, died at Berne on March 31st, 1932. The Deputy Secretary-General of the League, M. Avenol, sent the Polish Foreign Minister, M. Zaleski, the following telegram:

"Deeply grieved at the death of the Minister M. Sokal. I beg of you to receive on my own behalf and on behalf of the League Secretariat our sincere sympathy with the loss suffered by the Polish Republic in the person of M. Sokal. His devotion, his keen intelligence and his perfect loyalty were the principal features of many years

of co-operation on which we shall look back with affection and respect."

M. François Sokal was born in 1882. In 1918 he was appointed Director of Labour and then Chief Labour Inspector. In this capacity he participated in the work of the Commission on Labour Legislation at the Paris Peace Conference and in the first session of the Washington Labour Conference. He represented his country on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. In 1924 he was appointed Minister of Labour and Public Assistance, and continued to co-operate with the Governing Body of the International Labour Office until his death.

M. François Sokal collaborated with the work of the League ever since its inception; he was a member of the Polish delegation and was, in 1926, appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Polish Delegate to the League.

On several occasions he sat at the Council table and represented the Polish Government on numerous commissions. He was second Polish delegate to the Disarmament Conference.

VI.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

April 15th.—Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, Geneva.

April 21st.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Automobiles, Geneva.

April 25th.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Timber, Geneva.

April 25th.—Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

April 25th.—Financial Committee, Geneva.

April 28th.—Joint Sub-Committee of Economic and Financial Committees.

April 28th.—Gold Delegation of the Financial Committee, Geneva.

May 2nd.—Economic Committee, Geneva.

May 4th.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

May 12th.—Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, Frankfurt.

July 12th.—Delegation of Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth, Geneva.

July 18th.—Plenary Session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

July 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. SESSIONS OF THE COURT.

The twenty-fourth (ordinary) session of the Court, which began on February 1st, closed on March 8th. The next session is expected to begin on April 18th.

2. CAPHANDARIS-MOLLOFF AGREEMENT OF DECEMBER 9TH, 1927.

On March 8th, the Court delivered the Advisory Opinion for which it had been asked by the Council in regard to the following questions:

"In the case at issue, is there a dispute between Greece and Bulgaria within the meaning of Article 8 of the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement concluded at Geneva on December 9th, 1927?"

"If so, what is the nature of the pecuniary obligations arising out of this agreement?"

The Court gave a negative answer to the first question; accordingly, the second question, in view of the terms in which it is stated, did not require an answer.

The Court's decision was adopted by eight votes to six; the six judges composing the minority (M. Adatci, Count Rostworowski, M. Altamira, M. Schücking, Jonkheer van Eysinga, Judges, and M. Papazoff, Judge *ad hoc*) confined themselves to recording their dissent without publishing a dissenting opinion.

In its opinion the Court begins by indicating the origin of the questions submitted to it. By a letter of August 7th, 1931, the Bulgarian Government laid before the Council a question which had arisen between Bulgaria and Greece owing to the fact that the latter country, considering that it was "entitled to connect its debt to the Bulgarian refugees with the Bulgarian Government's debt on reparation account and to set off one against the other," had not made a payment due in respect of the first of these debts. Bulgaria had taken this step "with special reference to Article 8 of the Agreement" (the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement).

The origin of the Bulgarian debt on reparation account is to be found in Article 121 of the Peace Treaty of Neuilly; its amount and the methods of payment were finally fixed by the Agreement concluded at The Hague on January 20th, 1930, and by the "Trust Agreement"

concluded on March 5th, 1931, between the Governments which were creditors of Bulgaria and the Bank for International Settlements at Basle.

As regards the Greek Debt "to the Bulgarian refugees," which is described as an "emigration debt," its origin is as follows: The Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria (the Treaty of Neuilly) provided, in the interests of peace in the Balkans, for the "reciprocal and voluntary" emigration of Bulgarians (by race, language or religion) in Greece to Bulgaria, and of Greeks (by race, language or religion) in Bulgaria to Greece. The detailed arrangements in regard to this emigration were laid down by the Greco-Bulgarian Convention of November 27th, 1919, and by the Regulations (March 6th, 1922) drawn up by the Mixed Commission instituted by the Convention. The financial features of the system were modified, first, by a "Plan of Payments" issued on December 8th, 1922, by the Commission, in agreement with the two Governments concerned, and then by an arrangement concluded between those Governments on December 9th, 1927, with the consent of the Commission. This arrangement was the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement. According to the system at present in operation, immovable property left in Bulgaria (or Greece) by emigrants proceeding to Greece (or Bulgaria) is liquidated for the benefit of such emigrants, the ownership of the property passing to the State of Bulgaria (or Greece). Bulgaria (or Greece) pays the emigrants partly in cash, partly in bearer bonds, and becomes the creditor of Greece (or Bulgaria) for a corresponding amount. Finally the State whose claim upon the other is the largest—i.e., in point of fact Bulgaria—becomes the creditor of the other State in respect of the balance. It is this balance which constitutes the Greek Emigration debt.

On June 20th, 1931, President Hoover announced the well-known proposal of the United States Government regarding a moratorium for one year in respect of all payments on inter-governmental debts.

The Greek Government considered that if this proposal were to cover not only German Reparations but also what are known as "Easter Reparations," including Bulgarian Reparations, it should also cover—*inter alia*—the Greek Emigration debt. The Bulgarian Government, on the other hand, held that the proposal

* This chapter has been prepared with the aid of information furnished by the Registry of the Court.

covered its reparation debt but that its claim against Greece in respect of emigration was not covered thereby.

The Committee of Experts which met in London in July–August, 1931, in order to recommend what measures should be adopted to give effect to the Hoover proposal, declared in its report of August 11th that it was not competent to decide this difference of opinion between Bulgaria and Greece; it held that this matter must be settled directly between the Governments concerned.

It was in these circumstances that the Council, to which the question whether Greece was entitled to connect the two debts and to set them off one against the other was referred by Bulgaria, decided, after lengthy and important proceedings both written and oral, to ask the Court for an Advisory Opinion.

In the view of the Court, this question is tantamount to asking whether Greece is justified in her contention that, if she is to agree to the application of the Hoover Plan to payments on account of Bulgarian reparations, payments under the Greek Emigration debt must also be included in the suspension.

The Court considers, in regard to this point, that Greece's right to subject her acceptance of the Hoover Plan to a condition depends on the interpretation of that Plan, and has nothing to do with the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement. Admitting that the nature of the debt referred to in that Agreement is of importance for the solution of the problem, and that its nature depends on the Agreement, the interpretation of the latter would only come in as a question incidental or preliminary to the solution of another question, itself depending solely on the Hoover Plan. But the powers of the Council under Article 8 of the Agreement do not extend to interpreting the Hoover Plan.

For this reason, the Court considers that, in the case at issue, there is no dispute within the meaning of the above-mentioned Article.

This conclusion is in accordance with the Greek submissions; Bulgaria had maintained an opposite standpoint.

Nevertheless, it appeared from the written statements filed in the case and from the oral arguments heard by the Court that the two Governments concerned were agreed in desiring that the Court should, in any case, give an Opinion on the second question submitted by the Council, namely, in regard to the "nature" of the debt referred to in the Caphandaris-Molloff Agreement. The Court, however, con-

siders that it could not give its Opinion on this subject without transgressing the limits of its jurisdiction, as laid down in Article 14 of the Covenant and in the Statute of the Court.

3. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND.

The Norwegian Government filed its counter-case (with annexes) in this suit by the date fixed (March 15th).

4. DELIMITATION OF THE TERRITORIAL WATERS BETWEEN THE ISLAND OF CASTELLORIZO AND THE COASTS OF ANATOLIA.

On receipt of a request from the Italian and Turkish Governments, the Court, on March 8th, made an order extending until July 1st, 1932, the time-limit, originally fixed to expire on April 1st, for the filing by the two parties of their cases in this suit; the time-limits fixed for the submission of counter-cases and replies which were to have expired on July 1st and September 2nd, 1932, have similarly been extended until September 1st and December 1st, 1932, respectively. The case will be ready for hearing as from December 1st, 1932.

5. NEW EDITION OF THE COLLECTION OF TEXTS GOVERNING THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT.

In the month of March was published the fourth edition of the Collection of Texts governing the jurisdiction of the Court (Series D, No. 6), the publication of which had been approved by the Court at its twentieth session. The first edition of the Collection was issued on May 15th, 1923, the second is dated June, 1924, and the third December 15th, 1926. This Collection includes international instruments—treaties of arbitration, commerce, etc.—which, either as a whole or by one of their clauses, confer jurisdiction upon the Court. It is based exclusively on official information, that is to say, on official publications either of the League of Nations and its organs, or of Governments, or on direct communications emanating from these authorities. In order that the Collection should be as complete and correct as possible, States entitled to appear before the Court have been requested to supply additional information; a very large number of States have complied with this request. By this means it has been possible to include in the Collection a number of treaties which have not yet been published. The first part of the Collection reproduces the Court's constitutional documents, the second instruments having for their object the peaceful settlement of disputes; the third part contains the arbitration clauses taken from various

instruments providing for the Court's jurisdiction, and the fourth, clauses taken from instruments entrusting to the Court or its President some extra judicial function. Finally, the Collection contains tables classifying the instruments mentioned from various points of view.

6. PROTOCOLS OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1929.

The Cuban Government has informed the Secretary-General that it has withdrawn the reservations made by it when ratifying the Protocol of the 14th September, 1929, regarding the revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

ARMAMENTS YEAR-BOOK 1932

EIGHTH YEAR. SPECIAL EDITION.

GENERAL AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

474 pages Price : bound in cloth 10s. \$3.—

This special edition is a source of information, not only for delegates to the Conference, but also for all others who are anxious to follow closely the work of the Conference.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON DISARMAMENT AND MILITARY QUESTIONS

163 pages Price 2s. \$0.50.

This work has been prepared by the Political and Legal Reference Service of the League of Nations Library to supply information on the principal publications which have appeared in connection with disarmament and on a selection of works dealing with military questions. Brief summaries are given of the contents of the works mentioned.

DISARMAMENT PREPARATIONS FOR THE GENERAL CONFERENCE (February, 1932)

127 pages Price : 1s. \$0.25.

The Information Section of the League of Nations Secretariat has just issued this pamphlet containing a brief introduction, a summary of the obligations and assurances of the States of the world regarding armaments, a survey of the way in which the problem has been approached, an analysis of the Draft Convention presented to the Governments by the Preparatory Commission, the action of the Council and the Assembly of the League in 1931, including the text of the Draft Convention, a summary of the Washington and London Naval Treaties, etc.

Complete Catalogue sent free of charge on application.

**LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA**

PERIODICALS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

OFFICIAL JOURNAL

The *Official Journal*, which is published monthly (since January, 1922) in separate editions in English and French, contains the complete Minutes of the Sessions of the Council of the League of Nations, the text of the Reports and Resolutions adopted by the Council, as well as the principal official documents received or despatched by the Secretariat of the League.

Yearly subscription (12 numbers and index) £3 \$15.00

MONTHLY BULLETIN OF STATISTICS

A synopsis of the economic position of all important countries in the world in a convenient and concise form ; indispensable to all bankers, business-men and politicians who wish to keep abreast of world movements ; showing coal, pig-iron and steel production ; foreign trade ; price movements, cost of living ; unemployment ; gold reserves and note circulation, exchange and discount rates, etc., according to official information specially supplied each month. Data apply to over 50 countries. Published on the Thursday nearest to the 15th of each month.

Yearly subscription (12 numbers) 18/- \$4.50

MONTHLY EPIDEMIOLOGICAL REPORT

The Service of Epidemiological Intelligence and Public Health Statistics, Health Section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, receives current official reports on the prevalence of notifiable diseases from nearly all countries where such information is available. The information at present being regularly received and published in this periodical relates to 68 per cent. of the world's population.

Yearly subscription (12 numbers) 18/- \$4.50

BULLETIN OF INFORMATION ON THE WORK OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.

There are in existence over 400 international bodies formed by a general convention concluded between Governments or by private initiative. The *Quarterly Bulletin* aims at giving a summary of the proceedings at the meetings of those international organisations and of their periodical congresses or conferences. The more important resolutions adopted are reproduced *in extenso* and the dates and places of future meetings are recorded.

Yearly subscription (2 numbers) 5/- \$1.00

TREATY SERIES : PUBLICATION OF TREATIES AND INTER- NATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS REGISTERED BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Under the terms of Article 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations : " Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered." The publication of the *Treaty Series* fulfils this condition of the Covenant.

Subscription rate for 12 volumes from 400 to 500 pages each £6 \$30.00

A complete Catalogue of League of Nations publications sent free on application to :

**Publications Department of the League of Nations
GENEVA**

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly).

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price : per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents ; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly) :

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price : per number, 8d., 15 cents ; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals) :

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription : 5s. \$1.25

4. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual) :

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints) : 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints) : 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual) :

Price : 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly) :

Published every two months ; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price : per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents ; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (Trilingual) (Quarterly) :

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price : per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents ; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (Trilingual) (Annual) :

Price : 1s. \$0.25

9. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual) :

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription : 40s. \$10.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription : 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published :—

Vocational Guidance in Agriculture.	vii + 244 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
Colour Vision Tests.	47 pp.	2s.	\$0.50
*Unemployment and Public Works.	186 pp.	4s.	\$1.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations.	xii + 263 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s.	\$1.25
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky.	v + 212 pp.	4s.	\$1.00
Silicosis : Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August 1930.	iv + 692 pp.	16s.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931.	iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s.	\$1.50
		{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler.	v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
		{ Cloth bound	4s.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building.	xii + 378 pp.	5s.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation.	vii + 381 pp.	8s.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene.	vii + 188 pp.	6s.	\$1.50

11. SPECIAL REPORTS :

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include :—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY :

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price : 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE :

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only) £3 3s. od. \$16.00

Volume edition (in two volumes) { Paper bound £3 3s. od. \$16.00

{ Cloth bound £3 10s. od. \$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address : INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following :

GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. M. R. K. BURGE,
12, Victoria Street,
London, S.W. 1.
(Telegrams : Interlab,
Sowest, London.)
Telephone : Victoria, 2859.)

U.S.A.

American Sales Agents :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, Mount Vernon Street,
Boston 9, Mass.

JAPAN

Mr. J. ASARI,
Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya
Park, Kojimachiku,
Tokio. (Telegrams :
Kokusairodo, Tokio.)
Telephone : Ginza 1580.)

INDIA

Mr. P. P. PILLAI,
International Labour Office
(Indian Branch)
New Delhi.
(Telegrams : Interlab,
New Delhi.)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

**APPEAL FROM THE CHINESE
GOVERNMENT UNDER ARTICLE 15
OF THE COVENANT**

**Statement communicated by the Chinese Delegation
in Conformity with Article 15, Paragraph 2**

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. VII. 3.)

48 pages Price : 2s. \$0.50

**Explanatory Note communicated by the Japanese
Government**

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. VII. 5.)

13 pages Price : 9d. \$0.15

**Report by the Secretary-General on the Action taken
by the League on the Sino-Japanese Dispute**

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. VII. 6.)

30 pages Price : 1s. 3d. \$0.30

**Reports of the Committee of Inquiry set up at
Shanghai under Article 15, Paragraph 1,
of the Covenant**

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. VII. 4.)

10 pages Price : 6d. \$0.15

Complete Catalogue sent free of charge on application.

**LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA**

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 4.

APRIL, 1932

Financial Situation of
Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria,
and Greece.

Appeal of the Chinese
Government.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 4.

APRIL, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, April, 1932</i>	117	VII. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.</i>	118	1. Appeal of the Chinese Government	131
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		2. Report of the Straits Commission	135
International Engagements : Registration of Treaties	121	VIII. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions :</i>	
IV. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		1. Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People :	
1. The Economic and Financial Organisation :		(a) Meeting of the Advisory Commission	135
(a) Work of the Financial Committee	121	(b) Inquiry in the East	137
(b) Consultation on the Timber Trade and Industry	127	2. Traffic in Opium :	
2. Communications and Transit : Public Works.	128	Meeting of the Advisory Committee	139
V. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>		IX. <i>Other Questions :</i>	
1. Sixth Session of the Executive Committee of the Institute	129	1. Visit of the Emir Feisul	140
2. Directors' Committee of the International Museums Office	130	2. The Supervisory Commission	140
3. Educational Reform in China	130	X. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	140
4. International Educational Cinematographic Institute	130		
5. International Institute for the Unification of Private Law	130		
VI. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>			
Use of the Port of Danzig	131		

The Permanent Court of International Justice.

1. Sessions of the Court	141
2. Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex	141
3. Legal Status of Certain Parts of Eastern Greenland	141
4. Interpretation of the Statute of Memel	141
5. Optional Clause	142
6. Communication of Treaties	142

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

April, 1932.

April was marked by important discussions in the political and economic spheres, and in that of disarmament.

The Special Committee of Nineteen appointed by the Assembly presented its report on the situation as regards the Sino-Japanese dispute.

The Assembly thereupon held a plenary meeting at which it unanimously adopted the resolution submitted by its special Committee, the Japanese delegation abstaining. The President of the Assembly was, as a result of the vote, enabled to note that agreement had been reached

between the Chinese and Japanese Governments concerning the Shanghai armistice, which would be very shortly signed.

Other important discussions took place in the Council concerning the financial situation of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece, on the basis of a report from the Financial Committee, which examined the position at its March session. The Powers represented at the London Conference having expressed their view that before pronouncing finally on the Financial Committee's report they should have it examined by their financial experts, the Council decided to postpone consideration of the general part of the report until its next session, and meanwhile to lend the experts the assistance of the Chairman of the Financial Committee and of the qualified League organisations. As regards the special situation in the various countries, the Council heard the representatives of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece.

The General and Special Commissions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of

Armaments resumed and continued their discussions. The General Commission adopted resolutions regarding procedure and criteria for reduction. It approved the principle of qualitative disarmament and, in this connection, asked the Land, Naval, and Air Commissions to consider which weapons were most specifically offensive, which were most efficacious against national defence, or which were most threatening to civilians. The Special Commissions immediately began work on this classification.

Other meetings held during the month were the annual session of the Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, with its two Committees on Traffic in Women and Children and Child Welfare, the annual session of the Opium Advisory Committee, a Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment, a consultation of experts on timber, and a Committee of Jurists on questions concerning Danzig.

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, which had adjourned for the Easter recess, met at Geneva from April 11th to 26th. In accordance with its decision of March 16th, it began by discussing, from April 11th to 13th, the general principles involved in Article 1 of the draft Convention.

In the course of the debate, in which Mr. Gibson (United States), M. Motta (Switzerland), Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), M. Nadolny (Germany), M. Tardieu (France), General Cavallero (Italy), M. Litvinoff (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), M. Grandi (Italy), M. de Macedo Soares (Brazil), Tevfik Rustu Bey (Turkey), M. Cosio (Uruguay), Khan Ala (Persia), M. Marinkovitch (Yugoslavia), M. de Madariaga (Spain), M. Zaleski (Poland), M. Sato (Japan), and M. Munch (Denmark) took part, the Commission had to consider various recommendations and proposals concerning the problem of qualitative reduction of armaments. All these proposals were referred to the Bureau with instructions to analyse and co-ordinate them, together with the suggestions contained in the memoranda sent in in accordance with the Circular of March 17th, in view of their inclusion in the synoptic table previously adopted by the General Commission.

On April 18th, the Commission approved the report presented by Dr. Benes on behalf of the

Bureau and decided that the discussion should continue on the lines laid down in the list of questions adopted on March 8th.* It accordingly began by examining the following points:

1. The principle of reduction of armaments.

(a) Definitive reduction, under a single convention.

(b) Reduction to the lowest possible level.

(c) Reduction to be brought about by stages.

The Commission had first to take a decision on the question of reduction by a single convention or by stages. After speeches by M. Nadolny, M. Motta, M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia), M. Paul-Boncour (France), M. Burhardt-Bukacki (Poland), Kemal Husnu Bey (Turkey), M. Litvinoff, Baron Ramel (Sweden), Sir John Simon, Khan Ala, M. Beelaerts Van Blokland (Netherlands), M. Sato and M. Grandi, it instructed a drafting Committee, presided over by M. Politis, Vice-Chairman of the General Commission, and including the Belgian, British, Czechoslovak, Danish, Estonian, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Turkish, Soviet, United States, and Uruguayan representatives, and the rapporteur, Dr. Benes, to examine the suggestions and draft resolutions submitted.

On April 19th the drafting Committee submitted to the Commission the following draft

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 3, p. 110.

resolution which, after observations by M. Titulesco (Roumania), Khan Ala, M. Choumenkovitch (Yugoslavia), M. Litvinoff and M. Bosch (Argentina), was unanimously adopted :

"In view of the opinions expressed during the discussion at the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments ;

"The General Commission considers that the reduction of armaments, as provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, should, after this Conference has taken the first decisive step of general reduction to the lowest possible level, be progressively achieved by means of successive revisions at appropriate intervals."

The Commission then went on to discuss the question of principle raised in Point II. of its Agenda.

II. (a) Criteria for limitation or reduction.

(b) Taking into consideration of the particular conditions of the different countries.

(c) Method of computation of the effectives based on the absolute needs for internal order and relative needs for national defence.

After statements by M. Grandi, M. Sato, M. Lo (China), M. Litvinoff, M. de Madariaga, Khan Ala, and M. Paul-Boncour, the Commission instructed a drafting Committee composed of M. Politis (Chairman), Dr. Benes (rapporteur), and of the South African, Argentine, British, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Roumanian, Swedish, Soviet, and United States representatives, to prepare a draft resolution concerning paragraphs (a) and (b) of Point II.

On April 20th the drafting Committee submitted the following text :

"In view of the proposals submitted by various delegations concerning the criteria for the limitation and reduction of armaments ;

"The General Commission declares that, in determining those criteria, the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations shall be applied and that, in consequence, armaments must be reduced to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common consent of international obligations.

"It will be necessary, further, to take account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State.

"The General Commission decides that the application of these criteria and the methods by which the reduction and limitation of armaments must be effected should be immediately examined from a practical standpoint."

After speeches by Kemal Husnu Bey, M. Litvinoff, and M. d'Avila Lima (Portugal), the draft resolution was unanimously adopted, with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which voted against it.

At the request of Mr. Gibson, the Commission adjourned the discussion of paragraph (c) of

Point II. and went on to Point III., paragraphs (a) and (b).

(a) Simultaneous application of quantitative and qualitative limitation by the prohibition of certain material or of certain categories of armaments.

(b) Prohibition of certain material, except under certain conditions.

The discussion, as agreed, bore only upon the principle of qualitative limitation. Statements were made by the following speakers : Sir John Simon, M. Nadolny, M. Choumenkovitch, M. Grandi, Sir Thomas Wilford (New Zealand), Sir George Perley, (Canada), M. Colban (Norway), M. Paul-Boncour, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Lester (Ireland), M. Te Water (South Africa), the Aga Khan (India), M. Sato, M. Beelaerts van Blokland, M. Sheddou (Australia), M. d'Avila Lima (Portugal), M. Lo, Baron Ramel, M. Motta, M. Titulesco, M. Litvinoff, M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), M. Aguero y Bethancourt (Cuba), M. Tardieu, Count Apponyi (Hungary).

At the close of the debate, which took place from April 20th to 22nd, the following text was unanimously adopted :

"Without prejudice to other proposals which fall to be discussed under later heads of the agenda, the Conference declares its approval of the principle of qualitative disarmament—*i.e.*, the selection of certain classes or descriptions of weapons the possession or use of which should be absolutely prohibited to all States or internationalised by means of a general Convention."

On the same day, after statements by Sir John Simon, M. Scavenius (Denmark), Mr. Gibson, M. Choumenkovitch, the following supplementary resolution was also unanimously adopted :

"In seeking to apply the principle of qualitative disarmament as defined in the previous resolution, the Conference is of opinion that the range of land, sea, and air armaments should be examined by the competent Special Commissions with a view to selecting those weapons whose character is the most specifically offensive or those most efficacious against national defence, or those most threatening to civilians."

On April 23rd, the Chairman of the Land, Naval, and Air Commissions met in the presence of the Bureau of the General Commission to consider the procedure to be adopted by the Commissions for the accomplishment of their task. The Committee expressed the view that the Commissions should first discuss the texts of the resolutions adopted on April 22nd, in order to form a clear idea of their instructions before defining weapons falling within the three categories mentioned. The Committee, further,

considered that the Commissions should maintain relations through their respective bureaux and, should difficulties arise, appoint a joint commission which, if necessary, could also examine a special category of armaments, namely, chemical and bacteriological weapons, which did not fall exclusively within the sphere of any one of the three Commissions. The Committee proposed that, if necessary, the Bureau should fix the number of members of the Joint Commission and decide upon its character.

The Bureau met on April 25th and approved these suggestions. In view of the importance of the task entrusted to the Special Commissions, and in view also of the fact that their reports would have a direct bearing upon all the other points of the agenda, it considered that these Special Commissions should, from now on, meet continuously. The General Commission, therefore, decided on April 26th to suspend its meetings until the reports of the three Commissions on qualitative limitation should have been received. The President, Mr. Henderson, expressed the hope that heads of delegations would meanwhile succeed in private conversations in reaching agreement or in reconciling their points of view on certain of the questions of principle involved in Article 1 of the draft Convention.

In accordance with the decisions of the General Commission, the Special Commissions have, since April 26th, been discussing the questions referred to them by the resolution of April 22nd.

The *Land Commission* proceeded to a general discussion and then referred to a technical committee presided over by General Laidoner (Estonia), Vice-Chairman of the Commission, and including representatives of all delegations, the following questionnaire :

I.

1. What is meant by fixed and mobile artillery ?

2. What are the existing possibilities of rendering fixed artillery mobile, and *vice versa* ?

II.

1. What are the characteristics of artillery necessary for effective action against the essential organs of permanent fortifications : (a) weight of the projectile, (b) weight of explosive, (c) calibre, etc. ?

2. What are the characteristics of artillery necessary for effective action against entrenchments, field works, and other objectives of the battlefield ?

III.

1. In modern war, what is the depth over

which the troops and services and their equipment engaged in the battle are distributed ?

2. What are the characteristics of the artillery capable of firing beyond that depth ?

The *Naval Commission*, after a general discussion, decided to attack the problems referred to it in the following order of detail :

1. Capital ships ; 2. aircraft carriers ; 3. submarines ; 4. mines ; 5. other questions, including, more particularly, chemical and bacteriological warfare and coast fortifications.

The *Air Commission* referred to a special committee consisting of its bureau and of the Argentine, Belgian, British, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Swiss, Soviet, and United States representatives, the proposals with regard to offensive air armaments.

The bureau of the Commission has, in accordance with its previous decisions, summarised in a documentary study the proposals made by delegations and international organisations with regard to the internationalisation of civil aviation, as well as any other measure calculated to prevent the use of civil aviation for military purposes.

As for the *Commission on National Defence Expenditure*, the technical Committee appointed has drawn up rules of procedure for the examination of material submitted by States. It decided that the material should be examined from the point of view of the universality of national defence expenditure, classification, concordance of model statements with the figures published by States, the checking of these figures, and the difficulties encountered by States in establishing a model statement. There will, first of all, be a written procedure, but a discussion on the whole of the material will take place in the Committee, in the presence of the delegate of the Power concerned. One of the principles raised has been the simultaneous exchange of information on national defence. It seemed logical to await the arrival of complete material from all Powers before beginning the examination of documents submitted by any one Power.

M. Sandler (Sweden) and Colonel Kissling (Switzerland) were instructed to make a preliminary examination of the material and to report to the technical Committee, which will decide whether the principle of the simultaneous exchange has been sufficiently upheld. The order in which the material should be taken has been determined by a draw. When complete material has been received, about twenty days will be allowed to enable delegates to send in their observations on the material of any given Power. This procedure is already in force as

regards the documents furnished by the Swiss, British, and Indian Governments, which have surrendered their right to the principle of the simultaneous exchange of information.

The *Sub-Committee on Moral Disarmament*, on the report of a small Committee appointed

on March 16th, drew up as follows the list and order of the questions to be examined: education, broadcasting, cinematography, the theatre, the press, legal questions. It began its discussion on the question of education and, more particularly, of primary education.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

• *Registration of Treaties.*

The treaties and international engagements registered with the League in April include the following:

An international convention on anti-diphtheritic serum (Paris, August 1st, 1931), presented by the Yugoslav and French Governments.

A provisional commercial agreement (Rio de Janeiro, January 14th, 1932) between Brazil

and the Economic Union of Belgium and Luxemburg, presented by Belgium.

A provisional customs agreement (Rio de Janeiro, November 30th, 1931) between Brazil and Denmark, presented by Denmark.

Agreements regarding the settlement of commercial debts between France and Latvia and France and Estonia, presented by Latvia and Estonia respectively.

Parcel post agreements between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Netherlands concerning British Guiana and Dutch Guiana, presented by the Netherlands.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

I. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Work of the Financial Committee.*

The resumption of the sixty-sixth session of the Council was marked by discussions of considerable importance on the report of the Financial Committee on the work of its forty-fifth session, held in Paris from March 3rd to March 24th.* The discussions, which took place on April 12th and April 15th, were presided over by the French representative, M. Tardieu and M. Paul-Boncour respectively.

On April 12th the Norwegian representative, M. Braadland, presented a summary of the general section of the Financial Committee's report.

In its report the Financial Committee begins with the description of the gradual intensification of the economic and financial crisis, and points out that, in the absence of prompt action in connection with certain major financial problems, such as political debts, the world situation has continued to deteriorate. This general deterioration has greatly affected the countries on behalf of which the Committee has been working, and the fact must now be faced that one of these, Austria, has been compelled to arrange for a standstill covering most of her banking debts; a second, Hungary,

has declared a moratorium of transfer on the great bulk of her external obligations, both public and private; and two others, Greece and Bulgaria, declared their inability to meet in full the service of the foreign debt in foreign currencies.

This inability to obtain the necessary foreign exchange is not peculiar to Europe, but is at the moment a widespread phenomenon, due primarily to the collapse in world prices. To meet their foreign debt service, the debtor countries have to export much larger quantities of merchandise than before, and to acquire the necessary surplus by endeavouring to restrict imports, in many cases by exchange control.

These measures have called forth reprisals and, faced by these new barriers, the debtor States have applied still more rigorous methods and have met with still greater obstructions. World trade is thus being submitted to progressive strangulation and, in the opinion of the Financial Committee, it is of paramount importance that creditor States should withdraw the impediments established to the detriment of the countries which have been forced to adopt temporary measures for the control of their currencies.

The fall in prices has also had an effect on State budgets, and this problem is not limited to the four countries in question. The Financial Committee states that it has been struck by

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 3, p. 111.

the relatively high proportion of expenditure on armaments. It believes that further reduction could be made in this direction and, in this connection, emphasises the importance of the work of the Disarmament Conference.

The Committee expressed the view that positive action is urgently necessary, but it does not believe that at the present moment a final solution can be put forward. The immediate and urgent problem is to gain time. It further recommends to the earnest attention of Governments the desirability of endeavouring to avert an intensification of the crisis by guaranteeing loans the proceeds of which should be placed at the disposal of certain Governments requiring financial assistance. The granting of such aid should be conditional on acceptance by the Governments concerned of such measures as the League may suggest for assuring sound administration of public finances and of the national bank. The proceeds of the loans should not be used for ordinary current budget needs, and they should only be considered as temporary measures to bridge an intermediate period.

Another point emphasised by the Committee is the desirability of the prompt establishment of closer economic relations in Central Europe. It draws attention to the position of Bulgaria, who may be in danger of finding herself isolated if not included in the group under consideration, and it mentions the regrettable lack of commercial intercourse between Bulgaria and Greece.

The measures suggested by the Committee for consideration by the Council include the appointment of a special independent person, free from political ties, but having the confidence of the Governments concerned, to render assistance in the technical discussions and negotiations which will, no doubt, precede the detailed elaboration of any reconstruction schemes. Considerations are also put forward concerning the action to be taken by a country which cannot meet all its foreign obligations. In a great number of cases the Committee believes that the financial prospects of short-term lenders depend upon the possibility of ultimate funding operations; further, that if long-term loans are allowed to fall into disrepute the possibility of such funding will be greatly decreased.

The Committee concludes as follows the general section of its report :

" The Committee has felt compelled to recognise that temporary alleviations are in some cases needed in respect of foreign indebtedness. But it is under no illusions, and it trusts that the countries concerned will be under no illusions,

as to the serious damage which will result in the future from this course. The shock to the credit and good name of the countries concerned cannot be gainsaid. A reputation for solvency built up over a number of years of painful effort is easily lost, and only with difficulty regained ; and however pressing may be the stress of the moment, the Committee feels that the very fact that this stress has led to a temporary default makes it all the more necessary that the countries concerned should, in their own interest, make every effort to restore at the earliest possible moment their reputations as good and solvent debtors and resume full transfer of their debt service. It is only by so doing that they can restore the current of their trade and secure the financial facilities on which, in an inter-related world, their economic structure has depended and is bound to depend in the future. It is only by so doing that they can justify the indulgence which they now seek and pass through the present storm with the least possible permanent damage to their economic life."

The President of the Council observed that, in the Financial Committee's view, the difficulties through which the Central European countries were passing, while due in part to internal causes, had their origin also in the economic crisis, the effects of which were more extensive. In addition to its recommendations concerning a short-term funding operation, the Committee had drawn attention to the importance of closer economic relations between the countries concerned with a view to general recovery. In this connection M. Tardieu made a brief statement regarding the London Conference held during the previous week. The four Governments, Great Britain, Italy, Germany, and France, had been unanimous in concluding that the re-establishment on a healthy foundation of the economic and financial situation called for rapid and concerted action on the part of the Danubian States, as well as on the part of other countries, and that such action might well constitute a first step on the road to the economic recovery of Europe. To be effective, the action for which the situation called must take place in such a manner as to enable the countries concerned to re-establish themselves on a sound footing, justifying the new investments of capital which the Financial Committee contemplated.

This funding operation raised important issues, particularly in connection with the problem of subscribers to existing loans and subscribers to future loans, as also in connection with the taxpayers of the States concerned and the Governments benefiting by the Loans. For these reasons the Powers taking part in the London Conference had considered that, before pronouncing finally on the Financial Committee's report, they should have it examined

by their financial experts. They, accordingly, proposed to ask the Council to postpone the general part of the report until the next session, at which the question would come before it in its entirety, and meanwhile to afford their representatives the assistance of the Chairman of the Financial Committee and of the qualified League Organisations.

The British representative, Sir John Simon, confirmed the British Government's support of this suggestion. His Government, he said, fully recognised the gravity and the urgency of the problem, but could not ask Parliament for powers to act in this matter without being convinced that further loans were the most desirable procedure and that measures had been devised by which the underlying causes of the existing difficulties would be remedied. The last thing to be desired was a position which would add nothing but a further load of debt to a burden which already seemed too heavy. The Government had also to take into account the financial and economic condition of Great Britain.

The British Government also considered that the report of the Financial Committee should immediately be examined by Government authorities and, in view of the urgent nature of the question, had taken the opportunity of joining with the other Governments in starting such an examination. The British representative agreed that the Council should be asked to authorise the collaboration of the Financial Committee and the other League technical organisations.

The British Government would do its utmost to ensure the speedy progress of the examination which, if possible, should be terminated before the Council's May session, but the questions were of such complexity for both the countries in distress and those to whom the appeal was made that time must be given for their study before definite conclusions could be reached in common.

The Italian representative, M. Grandi, expressed the view that the feature which characterised all the problems under consideration was their urgency. The close connections of an economic and financial character uniting Italy with the Governments in question were the best guarantee that the Italian Government would spare no efforts to contribute to the success of the action undertaken.

The German representative, M. von Bülow, thought that the Powers represented in London were all agreed that the situation created by the Peace Treaties deprived the countries under consideration of the possibility of economic

and financial existence. The aim in view had been to assure the possibility of such existence and to achieve that end by the common action of the rest of Europe and perhaps even of the whole world. The Powers regarded that common action as the first step to a possible wider action for the reorganisation of the whole economic life of Europe.

The starting point of the discussion had been the financial situation. Financial action was not, however, the only field which has to be considered. It had been immediately seen that an economic basis must be discovered upon which the countries concerned would be able to stand by themselves in future. The countries in distress should, in every way possible, be made independent of foreign aid.

The only point on which the authors had not been able to reach agreement was the methods by which that end should be brought about, and M. von Bülow greatly regretted that the public had very considerably exaggerated the difficulties which had arisen at the Conference. He had no doubt that a feasible and useful solution would be reached. His own country would do all it could to achieve this and to assure that all other countries would make a similar effort.

Speaking of the report of the Financial Committee, he expressed the view that it was of exceptional importance and that the part dealing with the general situation was of very immediate interest. He drew attention to certain points which had been emphasised by the rapporteur, namely the world-wide causes of the present situation and the necessity of a general remedy; international indebtedness and the need for immediate action; the relations between the present financial difficulties and the general situation of international payments and the world crisis; the Committee's remark concerning expenditure on armaments.

M. von Bülow agreed with the President and the British representative regarding the object and purpose of the work of Government experts and hoped that these experts would co-operate with the organs of the League.

The Chairman of the Financial Committee, M. Suvitch, emphasised the Committee's observation that the remedies contemplated ought not to be considered as measures for the final restoration of the situation. If the situation in Europe and throughout the world were to be restored, far-reaching solutions would have to be contemplated, which would call for the collaboration of all factors, political, economic, and financial.

It has not been the duty of the Financial Committee to consider the problem in its fullest extent; it had been bound to confine itself to certain definite facts and the appropriate remedies. It had, nevertheless, touched upon the fall in prices, the burden of debts increased by the fall in prices, and the need for closer co-operation in Central Europe.

The Committee had recommended certain measures of an exceptional and transitory character, including a loan to enable certain countries to meet their present difficulties. But it had held that there was one essential condition if the countries in a better position were to help those in immediate danger, and that was that the help furnished should be provided as quickly as possible.

On the report of the Norwegian representative, the Council noted the report of the Financial Committee and also noted that common action had been taken with a view to the establishment of closer economic relations on the part both of the Danubian States and of other countries. It endorsed the view of the Financial Committee as to the great importance of these negotiations. It authorised the Financial Committee and the League technical organisations to collaborate with the experts of the British, French, German, and Italian Governments when considering the report of the Financial Committee, and to give them any assistance required during their investigations. The report was placed on the agenda of the next Council meeting.

* * *

The separate sections of the report dealing with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece were considered by the Council on April 15th.

Austria.—In the sections of the report dealing with Austria, the Financial Committee made a recommendation with reference to concerted financial action—a subject which the Council had already reserved for consideration at its next meeting. As regards other questions, the Committee devoted special attention to the budget, the Federal Railways, the Credit-Anstalt, and the National Bank.

The outstanding commitments for investments by railways exceed already the maximum figure mentioned by the Chancellor last September. The Committee is of opinion that no further commitments should be made before the railway expert, Dr. Herold, has submitted a comprehensive plan for balancing the railway budget. It suggests that provision should be made through savings for covering the deficit on the private loans account of the railways and the commitments for investment.

As regards the Credit-Anstalt, a plan for reorganisation has been drawn up by the General Manager. The Committee considers that nothing would contribute more to the rehabilitation of Austrian finance than an early settlement of the question on lines which would remove uncertainty for the future. Since February 15th the discounts of the Credit-Anstalt with the National Bank have not increased. On the other hand, the reserve of the National Bank has steadily decreased. The Committee understands that the President of the Bank intends to bring an appropriate credit policy to bear upon the situation, but adds that, while fully appreciating the importance of such measures, it considers that, until they become effective, exchange regulations should be enforced, and expresses the view that an early study should be made of the amount of necessary imports into Austria.

Having noted the observations of the Financial Committee, the Council expressed the hope that every effort should be made to maintain budget equilibrium and to reach an effective settlement regarding the present banking problems.

The Austrian representative, M. Pflügl, said that the report depicted in unmistakable terms the present situation of Austria, and indicated the appropriate remedies. The Austrian Government would, he said, continue with the restricted resources at its disposal to cope with the situation. He gave certain explanations regarding the legislative measures to ensure budget equilibrium, commitments for investments, the deficit in the federal railways, exchange restrictions, etc., and informed the Council of certain steps which Austria had been obliged to take as regards the introduction of import prohibitions. The Austrian Government did not despair of obtaining the assistance of the Great Powers in establishing closer economic relations between Austria and other countries with a view to terminating the existing situation.

Hungary.—As regards Hungary, the Committee drew attention to the importance of making urgent efforts to balance the accounts of the public undertakings. The Committee expressed the opinion that the next budget should be reduced very considerably. Exports and imports are decreasing. Despite all her efforts, Hungary is faced by a constantly increasing inability to dispose of her goods abroad. A standstill agreement has been concluded with certain creditors, and the Committee trusts that similar agreements may be reached with others.

As regards the debt problem, the Committee

declares that, when necessary, it is prepared to suggest means for securing the assistance of one or more persons of international repute and experience who might, at the Hungarian Government's request, examine the various loans and make proposals for the consideration of all parties concerned.

The Council expressed the hope that the Hungarian Government would make every effort to secure budget equilibrium, and authorised the Financial Committee, in agreement with the President and the rapporteur, to suggest means for securing the assistance mentioned above, should such a course be requested by the Hungarian Government when a settlement of the various long-term debts of which the transfer is temporarily suspended has to be considered.

The Hungarian representative, M. Pelenyi, assured the Council that his Government was doing its utmost to restore its financial position and thanked the Council, the rapporteur, the Financial Committee, and the competent League departments for the attention they had invariably paid to Hungarian affairs.

Bulgaria.—In the section of the report dealing with Bulgaria, two problems are dealt with, the foreign debt and the budget.

After reviewing the debt situation, the Committee reaches the conclusion that transfers of the whole of the payments in respect of external public debt should be reduced by 50 per cent. during the six months April to September 1932, and that, before the end of this period, the problem should be re-examined. (The reduction contemplated is equivalent to an average monthly payment abroad of 45.5 million levas instead of 91 million levas.)

The Committee remarks that, since the 1926 loan and certain pre-war loans have priority over reparation payments in regard to the transfer of foreign exchange, it is obvious that no transfer can be made on account of reparations during the period in which a special system is to be applied for transfers on account of the public debt service.

The rapporteur suggested that the Committee's remarks might be brought to the attention of the Governments concerned. He recommended that if foreign creditors were asked to make these sacrifices, Bulgaria should do her utmost to put her budget in order. He also drew attention to several suggestions made by the Financial Committee to that effect, and expressed the hope that the Bulgarian Government would accept these suggestions.

The Bulgarian representative, M. Stefanoff, said that his Government would make every

effort to transfer for the service of its foreign state loans during six months from April 1st to September 30th, 50 per cent. of the total amount due on this account. The amounts not transferred would be credited to a special blocked account to be opened with the Bulgarian National Bank and utilised in accordance with the conditions prescribed by the Financial Committee. Monthly reparations payments would continue to be suspended pending a new settlement. The Government would make every effort to balance the budget and would take the action suggested by the Financial Committee. It would continue to consult the League Commissioner and to avail itself of his help. If, in accordance with the suggestions of the Financial Committee, the limit of the Government's powers for short-term borrowing and the limit for the discount of treasury bills were raised, the proceeds of further issues of such bills would be used only for the payment of budget arrears up to the end of the year 1931-1932. Issues of treasury bills would take place only with the agreement of the League Commissioner.

The Council, noting the views of the Financial Committee and the Bulgarian representative regarding Bulgaria's capacity to effect transfers on account of her foreign debt service, observed that the bondholders were alone competent to discuss these questions with the Government and to consent to such waiver of their legal rights as might appear to them to be called for. As regards the monthly reparation transfers, the Council expressed the desire to bring this question to the urgent attention of the Governments concerned. It noted the Bulgarian Government's declaration regarding internal measures in connection with its public finance, and approved the recommendations of the Financial Committee in this connection, and the proposals of the Bulgarian Government with reference to collaboration with the League Commissioner.

The Council agreed that, in view of the present difficulties the limit for short-term borrowing might be raised by 300 million levas, with a corresponding change in the limitation of discounts of treasury bills, provided the proceeds were used solely to meet arrears of payments for the financial year ending March 31st, 1932.

The Council drew the attention of the Bulgarian Government to the desirability of closer economic relations between Bulgaria and Greece.

Greece.—The problem that arises in Greece in consequence of the effects of the world crisis on her economic position is chiefly a transfer problem and then a budget problem.

In consequence of the considerable decline in revenue, the deficit for the financial year beginning April 1st was expected to amount to 1,800 millions. The Greek Government has reduced this deficit to 400 millions by various means, one of which closely affects the obligations contracted by Greece under the 1927 Protocol. The Financial Committee considers that a further effort can and must be made to balance the budget. As regards the State railways, the Committee considers that a general inquiry should be carried out by a railway expert; the Greek Government is in agreement with this suggestion and asks that an expert shall be appointed as soon as possible.

The transfer problem is extremely urgent owing to the continual depletion of the exchange reserve of the Bank of Greece. The Committee makes a recommendation connected with the concerted financial action on which the Council has referred the discussion to its next session and suggests that the Greek Government should suspend for one year the transfer of the funds necessary for the redemption of its external debt.

As regards the exchange position, the Committee considers that the Greek Government should, as soon as possible, reduce its commitments abroad, and suggests certain modifications in the Statute of the Bank of Greece. It urges that the budget should continue to provide the sums necessary for the amortisation of foreign debt, and that these funds should be paid into a special account and, if necessary, be temporarily employed by the Bank of Greece with the authorisation of the International Financial Commission for advances to the Greek Government for unavoidable expenditure on existing irrigation works.

It is to be understood that these advances would be repaid out of the first loan that Greece might float abroad for financing these works.

M. Venizelos (Greece) said that his Government was in entire agreement with the Financial Committee's diagnosis, but not with the treatment proposed. In order to deal with the situation, the Greek Government had asked that the public debt redemption payment should be suspended for five years and that a loan of 50 million dollars should be granted within four years to complete and improve drainage and irrigation works in the valleys of the Varder and Struma, the exploitation of which would enable the accounts of the country to be balanced and the debt redemption payment to be resumed.

In its report, the Financial Committee recommended that, during the present year,

Greece should receive financial support to the extent of ten million dollars. On the other hand, in place of the suspension of redemption the Committee proposed the suspension of transfer for one year only. M. Venizelos considered that suspension of redemption for five years was an indispensable minimum. If this relief were not granted, M. Venizelos would consider it his duty to refuse the help recommended by the Committee. Greece was hoping to make a real improvement in her financial situation in order to balance her budget, to deal with the difficulties of transfer and to complete the productive works in progress. It was most important that the budget for the present year should raise no serious criticism. No increase in taxation could be contemplated; but although unable to increase taxation Greece was making a considerable effort to reduce expenditure and had undertaken to do so in this year's budget by 500 million drachmas. But whatever reductions might be made, it would be impossible to submit a balanced budget to the Chambers unless the redemption payments were suspended.

The suspension of the external and internal debt redemption, the other sacrifices imposed on bondholders and the reduction of expenditure would make it possible to overcome budget difficulties. These measures, however, could not solve the problem of transfers. The cover of the bank of issue had diminished since Great Britain abandoned the gold standard to a most disturbing extent. Financial support at a suitable moment would have made it possible to deal with the difficulties of transfer.

The Council could not reach any decision until its session next month. The budget would have to be submitted to Parliament before that date, and coupons were payable on May 1st. The situation made it essential that the Government should not make any provision in this year's budget for debt redemption, and it was no less imperative to suspend transfer of the sums required for the payment of coupons on May 1st. These sums would be deposited in a blocked account.

M. Venizelos expressed the hope that these measures would only be provisional and that, as a result of the Council's decision next month, Greece would be in a position not only to transfer the sums required for the foreign debt service, but also to proceed with the works which would enable her at the end of five years to balance her accounts and meet her debt charges without external aid.

The representative of the Financial Committee, M. Kempner, thought that the responsibility

for such serious measures as the Greek Government believed should be taken in connection with the transfer of the foreign debt coupons must be left to that Government. The members of the Financial Committee were well aware of the exceptional difficulties which had made such measures appear necessary.

As regards M. Venizelos's statement that a loan of 10 million dollars would be inadequate to meet all obligations, the Financial Committee had thought that there might possibly be a change for the better in the situation and that this possibility should not be left out of account by a Government which was proposing to take such serious steps as the total suspension of the transfer of coupon payments on loans granted during many years. Should the general situation change, it would be disastrous if meanwhile a Government had damaged its international credit by dealing too severely with its foreign creditors.

M. Kempner did not desire to say that, in the case of Greece, no other course was possible for the moment. That would be to assume a responsibility which must be borne by M. Venizelos, whose experience was a guarantee to the Financial Committee that he would take the proper action. Nevertheless, if he would consider the gravity of the case and confine himself to the strict minimum he would, in M. Kempner's opinion, adopt the course which the Financial Committee considered imperative, in view of his country's situation.

M. Venizelos replied that he had not intended to say that he would refuse the financial aid of 10 million dollars, but that if, at the same time, Greece were not allowed to suspend redemption for five years she could not emerge from her present difficulties. He fully realised the importance of the step which was being taken and regretted having to take it after so many years of solvency.

In conclusion, M. Venizelos expressed the hope that the Great Powers would reach agreement and would finally succeed in establishing the situation which all desired.

The President stated that the Great Powers fully realised their responsibilities and could not be insensible to the appeal just addressed to them.

The Council, noting the views of the Financial Committee and the Greek representative, endorsed the opinion of the former that the bondholders were alone competent to discuss the question of transfers and the waiver of their legal rights. It agreed to the Committee's proposals with reference to the suspension of by Greece of debt redemption payments of 300

million drachmæ per year, subject to the following conditions suggested by the Committee: (1) that such debt redemption as can be made under existing provisions from the application of the State share in the profits of the Bank of Greece to the repayment of debt (approximately 70 million drachmæ last year) should be maintained; (2) that certain amendments with regard to the cover of the Bank of Greece should also be adopted; (3) that certain other minor amendments in the administrative provisions of the Bank of Greece Statutes should be passed. It requested the League Transit Organisation to assist the Greek Government in obtaining the services of a railway expert and drew the attention of the Greek Government to the desirability of closer economic relations between Greece and Bulgaria.

As regards the part of the resolution dealing with economic relations between Greece and Bulgaria, M. Venizelos informed the Council that he had conferred with the Bulgarian Finance Minister and the Director of the public debt, and that on both sides there was a sincere desire to reach an understanding on all questions at issue between the two countries. The two Governments hoped that, when the Reparations Conference met, all the difficulties between Greece and Bulgaria would have been settled.

* * *

The experts of the four Governments represented at the London Conference, Count Krosigk-Schwerin (Germany), Sir Frederick Leith-Ross (Great Britain), M. J. J. Bizot (France) and M. Beneduci (Italy), met at the League Secretariat on April 23rd to consider the report of the Financial Committee and study the situation of the countries dealt with therein. They heard the Chairman of the Financial Committee and several officials of the League Secretariat.

(b) SITUATION IN THE TIMBER TRADE AND INDUSTRY.

A delegation of the Economic Committee, composed of M. Schuller (Austria), Chairman, M. Dolezal (Poland), and M. Posse (Germany), proceeded, from April 25th to 27th, to a consultation of experts on timber trade and industry with a view to determining the cause of the crisis in this branch of economic activity and finding remedies. The International Institute of Agriculture was represented by its President, M. de Michelis, and experts from the following countries took part in the consultation: Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Roumania, Sweden, the

Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and Yugoslavia.

The experts described the situation as regards the timber trade and industry in their countries. The depression in the timber trade being due to a thorough lack of balance between production and consumption, they expressed their conviction that, in present circumstances, exporting countries should consider agreements in regard to the quantities to be exported.

The experts of the northern countries decided to open negotiations forthwith. A general meeting of all the exporting and importing countries concerned has been summoned to meet at Vienna on June 9th. The object of this meeting is to fix distribution and import quotas. The agenda also includes a French proposal for the creation of an international timber trade office to regulate trade between exporting and importing countries.

The Chairman of the Economic Committee said that he would draw the Council's attention to the international importance of this action in the present circumstances.

2. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

Public Works.

The Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment met in Paris from March 30th to April 2nd.* The Committee was called upon to consider plans for public works submitted by European Governments, which they regarded as providing a remedy for unemployment and also a possibility of developing national technical equipment. The League's opinion was to take the form of a recommendation for the financing of the undertakings as soon as the money market was favourable.

This whole question originated in a proposal of the International Labour Office. It was submitted to various League Organisations, in particular to the Commission of Inquiry for European Union. The Council referred it to the Transit Organisation, which, in its turn, referred it to its Committee on Public Works and National Technical Equipment. This body is presided over by M. Dorpmüller (Germany) and at present includes members of the Unemployment Committee of the International Labour Organisation.

The Committee considered some twenty plans, previously studied by rapporteurs, several of which it retained as corresponding to the aims pursued. On other schemes it asked the Governments concerned for further information,

* See Monthly Summary, Vol XI., No. 6, p. 161, No. 9, p. 223, and No. 10 p. 298.

and a certain number were rejected as not conforming to requirements.

The Committee began by laying down criteria upon which (over and above the essential question of technical feasibility) it considered its opinion should be based. It agreed upon three principal considerations, namely :

1. *The value of the plans from the point of view of the campaign against unemployment :* to what extent they would be likely to give work to a large number of labourers for a considerable length of time, both in the yards and in the undertakings furnishing the materials.

2. *The productive character of the works concerned :* this does not imply that works which are designed to combat unemployment must prove in advance that they are entirely self-supporting. The Committee, however, specified that as it was not called upon to give an opinion as to financial possibilities, its opinion could only be provisional.

3. *The international importance of the works :* here circumstances may vary according to specific cases ; the works may involve direct co-operation between several countries, new facilities for international exchanges, or any other form of international *rapprochement*.

* * *

The Committee points out that, for several of the plans, a technical and local investigation would be essential before it could give a final opinion from the point of view of technical possibility, utility, and productivity. Subject to this reservation, the Committee was, in certain cases, able to give a preliminary opinion.

The plans retained for submission to the Council include the following :

Plans presented by the Greek Government for the regulation of the water supply and the irrigation of the plains of Salonica and Seres. This plan was retained on account of its utility from the point of view of refugee settlement. The Committee made certain reservations as regards the economic aspect of the operation, in respect of which it could not take a decision without local investigation.

Plans for the construction of road and bridges, submitted by the Latvian Government. These were retained, despite their pre-eminently national character, on account of their utility from the point of view of economic development and employment. Estimates of 90 million Swiss francs seemed justified.

Numerous water supply and drainage schemes submitted by the Polish Government. The regulation of the Rawka, the completion of water works in certain towns of Upper Silesia, the

reconstruction of the Royal Canal in the Polesian Marshes (these works are being carried out), drinking water supply and sanitation in the cities of Lowicz, Kreszow and Lomza, drinking water supply in Lodz, extension of the drinking water supply in Warsaw, Poznan, Cracow, Lwow, Tarnow, Bydgoszcz, and Cattowitz. *Certain other plans submitted by the Polish Government for the development of the railway and road system.* The Committee pointed out that in certain cases these plans overlap and that it might become necessary to give preference to one or the other means of communication. Plans for speeding up the construction of the railway junctions of Warsaw and Cracow, supplemented by the construction of certain lines and the electrification of the Warsaw Suburban railway seemed of special interest, since this would combat unemployment in important urban centres. As regards the road system, the Committee recommended certain reductions.

Among plans presented by the Yugoslav Government, the Committee was able to retain

one for the construction of a road parallel to the Hungarian-Roumanian frontier, from the Austrian frontier (direction of Munich) towards the Greek frontier, (direction of Salonica) passing through Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade, Nis, Skoplje, Djvedjalia, with various branch roads to the capitals of neighbouring countries.

The Yugoslav plans for waterworks in Lake Scutari, the River Bojana, the lower reaches of the Drim, and the River Kiri were also retained subject to certain reservations, as well as plans for the construction of a railway with a bridge over the Danube, which would considerably shorten connections between Belgrade and Bucarest, and thus improve relations between Roumania and Western Europe.

Other plans in regards to which the Committee took no decision but asked for supplementary information include a scheme of road construction presented by the Roumanian Government and water works contemplated by the Bulgarian Government.

V.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION AND INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX.

I. SIXTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

The Executive Committee of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Directors' Committee of the Institute met on March 30th and 31st in Paris, under the presidency of Professor Gilbert Murray, Chairman of the International Committee, and M. Painlevé, Chairman of the Governing Body of the Institute. There were also present M. Castillejo, M. Destrée, Sir Frank Heath, M. Krüss, M. Roland-Marcel, M. Rocco, and M. Maurette, representing the International Labour Office.

The Committee began by hearing M. Bonnet, Director of the Institute, on the important results already achieved by the China Mission. The Mission has itself met at the Institute to complete its general report, which will be submitted to the Chinese Government. This work is important and difficult, and a little more time is required to complete it.

After this journey of Western Professors to the East, an official mission of Chinese educationists will visit Europe to study educational organisations in three countries. This step of the Chinese Government is a proof of the interest aroused in China by the journey of the League of Nations educationists.

As regards moral disarmament, the Committee considered a report of the Institute on the international aspects of broadcasting and passed a resolution re-affirming the very important rôle which the Organisation of Intellectual Co-operation can play in this connection. This resolution was forwarded to the Committee on Moral Disarmament, which discussed it at one of its recent meetings.

The Executive Committee had, further, to consider the agenda of various forthcoming meetings: the Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters; the Programme of the "Conversation" on Goethe (Frankfurt, May, 1932); A Conference of Institutes specialising in the question of intellectual property, whose programme includes several new questions; and, finally, a Conference of Institutes for the Scientific study of International Relations (Milan, May 23rd to 27th, 1932).

* * *

The Executive Committee also reviewed the work done by the Institute during the year and took note of the results achieved on each point.

These results may be summarised as follows: (1) Recommendations adopted by technical experts following discussions at the Institute; (2) documentary reports compiled by the Institute drawing attention to the results

obtained during the past year by inquiries concerning popular libraries and workers' leisure; interchanges of young people; school books; musical records, and poetry.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held at Geneva on July 15th.

2. DIRECTORS' COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MUSEUMS OFFICE.

The Directors' Committee of the International Museums Office held its annual session in April, at the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. M. Jules Destrée was in the chair. The Committee approved the report of the Secretariat on the work of the Office in 1931 and traced the main lines of its programme for the future. It studied several questions concerning museums, including problems in connection with gifts and legacies, as well as conditions governing the transfer, exchange, or deposit, of works which present no interest for the museum in whose possession they are. It considered what action should be taken as a result of the Athens Conference, which considered the preservation of artistic and historical monuments. In this connection it had before it a recommendation from the American Museum Association and the Latin Press Congress regarding the Philæ Monuments; these two organisations expressed the desire that the Museums Office should, in agreement with the Egyptian Administration, take steps with a view to international action for the preservation of these monuments.

The Committee, further, laid down the principles of an agreement between official cast workshops for the more economic utilisation of existing casts and the protection of their marks of origin. It took note of a scheme for an international exhibition of modern art, to be organised in Paris in 1937, and expressed the view that the Office might usefully co-operate by showing the progress made during the past few years as regards museums (architecture, lighting, heating, ventilation, presentation of collections, &c.).

Finally, the Committee, at the request of the International Popular Arts Commission, promised that the Office would assist in preparing a third session of that body, with an agenda including a study of out-door art museums.

3. EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN CHINA.

A mission of expert advisers, sent to China by the Council at the request of the National

Government,* to assist it in developing the Chinese educational system returned to Europe early in 1932, and, after drawing up a general report, held a short meeting on April 6th and 7th at the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Paris.

The mission included Professor Carl Becker, of Berlin University, former Minister of Education in Prussia, M. Falski, Director of primary education at the Polish Ministry of Education; M. Langevin, of the Collège de France, Professor Tawney of the London School of Economics and Political Science.

After local investigations, visits to universities, inquiries among professors and teachers, the consultation of documents and statistics, the mission formulated its first conclusions, which deal, more particularly, with administrative reforms, and agreed with the representatives of the Chinese Ministry of Education upon a certain number of preparatory steps to be taken as soon as possible.

The general report contains a series of recommendations concerning higher, secondary, and primary education in China—teacher training, vocational teaching, and the Mass Education movement—and, generally, the measures which should be taken to improve education.

4. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CINEMATOGRAPHIC INSTITUTE.

The eleventh session of the Permanent Executive Committee of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute was held in Rome on April 8th and 9th. M. Rocco was in the chair.

The Committee considered the report of the Director of the Institute on various internal questions and on the future work of the Institute. It decided that its next meeting should take place on October 11th and that the session of the Governing Body should be held on October 12th.

5. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW.

The Governing Body of the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law met in Rome on March 23rd, and the following days, under the presidency of M. Scialoja.

After adopting the report of the Secretary-General on the Rome Institute in 1931, the Governing Body continued its studies concerning sales, arbitration in private matters, and intellectual rights.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 7, p. 181.

VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

USE OF THE PORT OF DANZIG.

The Committee of Jurists instructed by the Council to advise it on the question of the utilisation by Poland of the Port of Danzig met at Geneva from April 1st to April 7th.

The High Commissioner of the League at Danzig, Count Gravina, asked by the Free City to decide that Poland was obliged, in accordance with the decision of the former High Commissioner, General Haking, to make full use of the Port of Danzig, consulted last year a Committee of Jurists. On the basis of the opinion given by the majority of the Committee, the High Commissioner gave his decision on October 26th, 1931.

Both the Danzig and Polish Governments having appealed to the Council from this decision, the Council reconsidered the question last January and entrusted the same Committee of Jurists with the examination of the fresh legal problems raised by the parties.* The Committee was left entirely free to examine

the conclusions of the opinion presented last year in the light of the decision of the High Commissioner and the arguments submitted by the two Governments.

The Committee of Jurists was originally composed of M. Raested (Norwegian), former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Chairman; M. Hostie (Belgian), Secretary-General of the Rhine Commission, Member of the Legal Committee of the Transit Organisation, and Sir John Fischer Williams (British). The latter, having declined the invitation to serve again on the Committee because he had recently pleaded before the High Court as Counsel for one of the parties, was replaced by Mr. J. L. Brierly, Professor of International Law at Oxford University.

The Danzig Government was represented on the Committee by M. Buttner and M. Ferber, and the Polish Government by M. Sobolewski and M. Lubienski. The League High Commissioner in Danzig was also present.

VII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The negotiations with a view to the conclusion of an armistice recommended by the Assembly resolution of March 4th* opened on March 14th at Shanghai between the Chinese and Japanese representatives, with the assistance of the representatives of the four Powers with special interests in the Settlements.

They continued until the beginning of April, but, on the 11th of that month, the Chinese delegation, in a communication to the Special Committee of Nineteen, appointed by the Assembly under the presidency of M. Hymans, drew attention to the fact that the negotiations had entered upon a critical stage and that agreement between the Chinese and Japanese Governments seemed improbable. The Chinese Government, accordingly, asked that the Committee should be summoned. The next day the Chinese delegation laid before the Committee a memorandum and a summary of the Shanghai negotiations.

The Japanese delegation transmitted similar documents on April 14th and 15th. From these communications it appeared that the suspension of negotiations at Shanghai was due to the fact that the text of the agreement drawn up indicated no time-limit for an initial withdrawal

of the Japanese forces to certain points outside the international Settlement of Shanghai. The Chinese proposal to fix a time-limit for the complete withdrawal of the Japanese troops from the Settlement and from the roads outside the Settlement, had not been accepted by the Japanese representative.

During the negotiations the suggestion had been made that a paragraph should be inserted in Annex II. to the Agreement containing a formula designed to reconcile the Japanese and Chinese points of view. The Japanese Government rejected this formula, but put forward a counter-proposal to the effect that a declaration should be made by the Japanese Government in the following terms:

"The Japanese Government takes this opportunity to declare that as soon as local conditions in and around Shanghai so improve as to afford a sense of security to Japanese nationals as regards protection of lives and property and lawful pursuit (and it hopes that conditions will have so improved within six months or sooner) the Japanese troops will be further withdrawn to the International Settlement and extra-Settlement roads in Hongkew District as before the incident of January 28th, 1932."

The Chinese delegation, regarding this declaration as inadequate, proposed to alter it in the sense of stipulating a period of four months or less for the withdrawal of the Japanese

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII, No. 1, p. 14.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII, No. 3, p. 82.

troops, during which period normal conditions were to be re-established in and around Shanghai.

The Japanese delegation rejected this amendment, but eventually both delegates agreed to refer the following new formula from the Japanese delegation to their respective Governments:

"The Japanese Government takes this opportunity to declare that as soon as local conditions in and around Shanghai return to normal—and it hopes that conditions will have so returned within six months or sooner—the Japanese troops will be further withdrawn to the International Settlement and the extra-Settlement roads in the Hongkew District as before the incident of January 28th, 1932."

The representatives of the four Powers taking part in the negotiations, namely Great Britain, France, the United States and Italy, understood that the Japanese Government would be willing to make a declaration to this effect. The Chinese Government, however, also regarded the new formula as inadequate.

The Assembly Committee met on April 15th under the presidency of M. Hymans.

After noting the articles and annexes of the draft agreement submitted, it reached the conclusion that these articles, which had been accepted by the parties, were in conformity with the spirit of the resolutions of March 4th and 11th. As regards the difficulty which had arisen, the Committee instructed its President to get into touch with the representatives of the parties in order to seek means of settling it.

At a Committee meeting of April 16th following these conversations, M. Hymans explained that the text of the agreements negotiated at Shanghai appeared to offer means of reconciling the parties. The text of the Agreement was as follows:

Article I.—Final cessation of hostilities, undertaking that the forces of the two parties will, so far as it lies in their control, cease all and every form of hostile acts in the neighbourhood of Shanghai. In the event of doubts arising in this connection, verification by representatives of friendly Powers.

Article II.—The Chinese troops to remain in their present positions pending later arrangements concerning the re-establishment of normal conditions in the area dealt with by the Agreement.

Article III.—The Japanese troops to withdraw to the International Settlement and the extra-Settlement roads in the Hongkew District, to the positions in which they were stationed before the incident of January 28th, 1932, it being understood however, in view of the numbers of Japanese troops to be accommodated, that some of them would have to be temporarily stationed in localities adjacent to the above-mentioned areas.

Article IV.—Establishment of a joint commission, including members representing the friendly Powers participating in the negotiations, in order to survey mutual withdrawal and to collaborate in arranging for the transfer of the territory evacuated by the Japanese forces to the Chinese police who will take over as soon as the Japanese forces withdraw.

Article V.—The Agreement to come into force on the day of signature.

ANNEX 1.

Definition of the positions now occupied by the Chinese troops. In the event of doubt, verification of the said positions, at the request of the Joint Commission, by the representatives of the friendly Powers, members of the said Commission.

ANNEX 2.

Withdrawal of the Japanese troops to the localities where they are to be temporarily stationed, such withdrawal to begin in the week following the coming into force of the Agreement, and to be completed four weeks after the commencement of the withdrawal.

ANNEX 3.

Composition of the Joint Commission which will contain representatives of the Chinese and Japanese Governments and of the heads of the missions in China of the four friendly Powers taking part in the negotiations. All matters of procedure will be left to the discretion of this Commission whose decisions will be taken by majority vote, the Chairman having a casting vote. The Commission will watch in such manner as it deems best, in accordance with its decisions, the carrying out of the provisions of Articles I, II, and III. of the Agreement.

In view of the terms of this Agreement, and the explanations supplied to its Chairman by the representatives of the parties, the Committee considered that it would be fulfilling its rôle as a conciliating body, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Assembly resolution of March 11th (part 3) in communicating to Governments through the intermediary of their delegates a preliminary draft resolution (April 19th) prepared by a Drafting Sub-Committee.*

The provisions of this resolution, with the exception of paragraph 11, were identical with those of the resolution which the Assembly adopted on April 30th, and which is given below. In paragraph 11 the Special Committee stated that it "is of opinion that the powers, as defined in Annex 3 of the draft Agreement, of the Commission which is to watch the carrying out of Articles 1, 2, and 3 of that Agreement

* This Drafting Sub-Committee was composed as follows: Chairman, M. Benes (Czechoslovakia), M. de Madariaga (Spain), M. Motta (Switzerland), M. Paul-Boncour (France), Baron Ramel (Sweden), M. Restrepo (Colombia), M. Rosso (Italy), Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), M. von Weizsacker (Germany).

include competence to declare, at the request of one of the parties, that the moment has come when the complete withdrawal of the Japanese troops can reasonably be effected." The Committee added that it "hopes that all the decisions of the General Commission will be unanimous, but observes that under the terms of the Annex referred to above if unanimity is not possible effective decisions are to be taken by majority vote, the Chairman having the casting vote."

The Chinese Government accepted the draft resolution as a whole. The Japanese Government stated that it could not accept paragraph 11.

On April 26th, the Committee was informed that the two parties could probably arrive at an agreement on the basis of a new formula which, after being proposed to the Chinese Government by the British Minister, Sir Miles Lampson, President of The Commission of Friendly Powers participating in the Shanghai negotiations, had been communicated to the Japanese Government.

On April 28th, the Committee was informed that negotiations had been resumed at Shanghai and that it had been agreed to insert at the end of Annex 3 the following words: "The Commission will watch . . . and is authorised to call attention to any neglect in the carrying out of the provisions of the three articles mentioned above."

The parties having reached an agreement on this new formula, the Committee adopted, for paragraph 11 of its draft resolution, the final form, which was that submitted to the Assembly. On April 30th the Assembly, which had adjourned on March 11th, held a plenary meeting. The President began by expressing his profound indignation at the news of the outrage committed at Shanghai against the Japanese Minister in China, several Japanese Generals and the Consul-General of Japan. The Japanese representative, M. Nagaoka, on behalf of his Government and country, thanked the Assembly for this mark of sympathy.

The President then announced that the Assembly had been convened in execution of its resolution of March 11th, which provided that the Special Committee should, as soon as possible, report on the cessation of hostilities in the region of Shanghai, and on the conclusion of agreements designed to render such cessation definitive and to regulate the withdrawal of the Japanese forces.

Emphasising that, for several weeks, hostilities had virtually ceased in the region of Shanghai, and, further, that the withdrawal of the Japanese forces was in progress, he gave a brief summary

of the Shanghai negotiations and of the work of the Special Committee. In conclusion, he submitted to the Assembly the following draft resolution:

"The Assembly,

"1. Considering that its resolutions of March 4th and 11th recommended that negotiations should be entered into by the Chinese and Japanese representatives, with the assistance of the military, naval, and civilian authorities of the Powers having special interests in the Shanghai settlements, for the conclusion of arrangements which shall render definite the cessation of hostilities and regulate the withdrawal of the Japanese forces;

"2. Considering that while it is not for its Committee to take the place of the negotiators—since the arrangements contemplated in the Assembly resolutions of March 4th and 11th can only be concluded on the spot—every Power represented in these negotiations is entitled, should serious difficulties be encountered in the course of the negotiations or in the carrying out of the above-mentioned arrangements, to notify the Committee, which exercises its functions on behalf of and under supervision of the Assembly, of those difficulties;

"3. Considering that the negotiations should be pursued in accordance with the above-mentioned resolutions, no one of the parties being entitled to insist on conditions which would be incompatible with the said resolutions;

"4. Having noted the articles of the draft armistice which have been communicated to the Committee of the Assembly and have been accepted by the two parties;

"5. Considers that these articles conform to the spirit of the said resolutions;

"6. Notes in particular that under Article III of the said draft, the Japanese Government undertakes to carry out the withdrawal of its forces in the International Settlement and the roads outside the Settlement in the Hongkew district as before the incident of January 28th, 1932;

"7. Declares that it is in accordance with the spirit of the resolutions of March 4th and 11th that this withdrawal should take place in the near future;

"8. Declares that the resolution of March 4th will only have been fully complied with when the Japanese forces have been entirely withdrawn;

"9. Notes that the draft Agreement provides for the establishment of a Joint Commission, including neutral members, to certify, the mutual withdrawal and to collaborate in arranging for the transfer from the evacuating Japanese forces to the incoming Chinese police, who will take over as soon as the Japanese forces withdraw;

"10. Notes with satisfaction that the said Commission will in accordance with its decisions watch in such manner as it deems best the carrying out of Articles I., II., and III., of which the last-named provides for the complete withdrawal of the Japanese forces as before the incident of January 28th;

" 11. Is of opinion that the powers, as defined in Annex 4 to the Draft Agreement, of the Commission which is to watch the carrying out of Articles 1, 2, and 3 of that Agreement, include authority to call attention, in accordance with its decisions taken in such manner as it provided in the said Annex, to any neglect in carrying out any of the provisions of the articles mentioned above.

" 12. Earnestly recommends the parties in question to continue the negotiations with a view to reaching their rapid conclusion, and requests the Governments having special interests in the Shanghai Settlements to continue to lend their good offices for this purposes ;

" 13. Expressly points out that unless a conclusion is reached as laid down in the resolutions of March 4th and 11th, the question will necessarily come up again before the Assembly ;

" 14. Requests the Governments of the Powers having special interests in the Shanghai Settlements to transmit to the League of Nations the information which will be in the possession of the Mixed Commission in virtue of its functions, and will be furnished to those Governments by their respective representatives on the Commission."

The Chinese representative, M. Yen, briefly retraced the history of the Shanghai negotiations and drew attention to the fact that, in every case, China had accepted, and Japan had rejected, the proposed terms of armistice and that, after every such impasse, the negotiations had been resumed only as a result of important concessions on the part of the Chinese Government. Although he could not regard the present formula as a fair solution, he informed the Assembly that the Chinese Government had decided to accept it as a practical one, while reserving all its rights in virtue of the Covenant and international law in general. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Special Committee and the Assembly would continue to supervise the full and prompt execution of the present and previous resolutions.

The Japanese representative, M. Nagaoka, said that his Government was happy to note that an agreement was about to be signed at Shanghai. The Japanese Government would loyally carry out this agreement, which was a happy sequel to the resolution of March 4th. In view of the fact that the Japanese Government maintained the position of reserve it had always assumed regarding the application of Article 15 of the Covenant to the Sino-Japanese dispute, the Japanese representative would be obliged to abstain from voting, but he assured the Assembly that this attitude did not in any way affect the firm intention of his Government to do all in its power to ensure that the negotiations in progress at Shanghai should reach a successful conclusion in the shortest possible time.

By a vote taken by roll-call, the resolution was unanimously adopted, the Japanese delegate abstaining.

The Assembly then adjourned, leaving it to its President to reconvene it if necessary.

* * *

On March 17th the Special Committee of the Assembly had requested the Chinese and Japanese Governments to inform it of the measures they had taken or intended to take in the near future to give effect to the Council resolutions of September 30th and December, 10th, 1931.

On April 13th the Chinese representative forwarded the desired information and, later, transmitted further indications concerning the situation in Manchuria.

On April 8th the Japanese representative on the Council sent the Secretary-General a note dealing with the general situation, based on the two Council resolutions.

*Commission of Inquiry in the Far East.**—At the beginning of April the Commission of Inquiry presided over by Lord Lytton visited Nanking, Hankow, Tientsin, and Peking, where it conferred with the authorities who had been in charge of the three provinces of Manchuria up to September 18th. On April 21st it arrived in Mukden and at the end of the month was still in that locality. On April 30th the Commission addressed to the Council a preliminary report on the existing situation in so far as it affected the execution by the Chinese and Japanese Governments of certain undertakings entered into by the Council resolutions of September 30th and December 10th.

As the Commission was not in a position to furnish complete information, which has been reserved for a later report, the preliminary report confines itself to information on the effectives of the Japanese regular force inside and outside the South Manchurian Railway Zone, on those of the Manchukuo † Army and the local police force, and on the regular or volunteer forces fighting the Japanese troops and the Manchukuo Army.

The report concludes in the following terms :

" The Commission purposely refrains from commenting at this stage on the facts and figures above recorded. The Japanese authorities maintain that they cannot at present withdraw their

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 3, p. 109.

† Troops designated by the Japanese military authorities as the " Manchukuo Army " are said to have been formed partly of Chinese regular troops stationed in Manchuria before September 18th and subsequently re-organised, and partly freshly-recruited soldiers. This force has been created with the help of Japanese military authorities.

troops without endangering the 'safety of the lives and property of their nationals' outside the Railway Zone. They appear to consider that this withdrawal must depend on the progress of the reorganisation of the troops described as the 'Manchukuo Government Army.' The Chinese Government does not now exercise authority in any part of Manchuria, and as events have developed recently the practical question of the fulfilment of its responsibilities has not arisen. The possible and equitable measures which may restore peace and security and create a reasonable measure of goodwill throughout Manchuria will be considered by the Commission in its final report."

2. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STRAITS COMMISSION.

The Straits Commission, which works at Stamboul under the League's direction, has sent in its report for 1931.

The report is in three parts: the first describes the work of the Commission in 1931; the second gives information on present conditions of passage for vessels and aircraft through the Straits from the Black Sea to the Ægean, and the third contains three documentary annexes.

1. *Work of the Commission.*—The report explains the general working of the Commission and gives details of its budget. It describes the composition of the strongest fleet in the Black Sea, that of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and gives information on the passage of warships through the Straits in 1931. A change has been made in navigation regulations for certain zones of the Sea of Marmora.

As regards the sanitary régime, the Commission again protests, as in earlier reports, against the levy of health dues on ships in transit; it gives the text of various circulars of the general sanitary service, which apply to navigation.

Describing the working of the salvage service, the report draws attention to the difficulties encountered in the Black Sea in the early months of the year; it congratulates the Turkish Salvage Company on its activity, and expresses the hope that salvage dues, at present very heavy, may be reduced. Information is given

on the changes in the organisation of this service and in the Stamboul port regulations. The Commission notes that two new submarine cables have been laid in the Southern part of the Bosphorus and between Kartal and the Island of Prinkipo; and that certain modifications have been introduced in the lighthouses of the Nagara Promontory and Koum-Kalé.

2. *Conditions of Passage.*—The report describes the regulations in force for war and merchant vessels passing through the Straits and calling at Straits ports and for military and civil aircraft passing through the Straits and bound for Turkish territory via the Straits.

3. *Documents.*—The report gives the regulations for the admission of foreign warships to Turkish ports, the Stamboul port regulations, the Turkish air regulations, the various taxes applicable to vessels in the Straits region, instructions on piloting and towing, and a table of meteorological signals.

A table of the commercial traffic in the Straits in 1931 indicates the relative importance of the maritime traffic of the various countries (with the exception of the Turkish merchant fleet) and shows that the traffic has increased. 1931 shows an aggregate tonnage of 19,198,346, whereas in 1930, 1929, and 1928 the tonnage was respectively 17,864,753, 12,767,012, and 9,218,371.

The following figures show the rank occupied by the various countries as regards aggregate merchant tonnage passing through the Straits.

Italian	5,016,973 tons
British	3,684,132 "
Greek	3,351,389 "
Norwegian	1,454,169 "
French	1,109,469 "
German	813,099 "
Dutch	668,618 "
Roumanian	605,816 "
Belgian	374,357 "
American	370,802 "
Russian	324,472 "
Swedish, etc.	312,620 "

VIII.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

1. PROTECTION AND WELFARE OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

The Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, which is composed of the Traffic in Women and Children Committee and the Child Welfare Committee, met at Geneva from April 4th to 15th.

The first of the two Committees sat from April 4th to 9th and the second from April 9th to April 15th. The two Committees held joint meetings on April 9th and 10th.

(a) *Traffic in Women and Children.*

1. *Ratification of Conventions.*—Since the last session of the Committee Lithuania has ratified

the 1921 Convention; Monaco has acceded to the 1921 Convention, to the Agreement of 1904 and the Convention of 1910; the British Colonies, Protectorates, and mandated territories of Gambia, Uganda, Tanganyika, Palestine, including Trans-Jordan, Zanzibar, Sarawak, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, and the Solomon Islands have ratified all three instruments.

Egypt has decided to accede to the 1921 Convention. The Government of Panama has intimated that it will submit the Convention for approval to the National Assembly of September, 1932. Peru and Turkey are considering the possibility of acceding. The Committee's attention has, on the other hand, been drawn to the fact that the following States Members of the League, Abyssinia, Argentine, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, the Irish Free State, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Salvador, and Venezuela have not yet acceded to the 1921 Convention.

2. *Annual Reports.*—In examining the annual reports of Governments for 1930, the Committee noted that a large number of States did not yet report regularly to the Secretariat, and asked the latter to make special efforts to obtain more information in future. The Committee is of opinion that the annual reports are of the greatest importance for its work, as the reports of 1930 mention several thousand cases of traffic. The examination of the reports raised various problems: employment agencies, the migration of young women, the abolition of regulation as regards prostitution and the danger that unemployment and the present economic depression may result in increased prostitution.

The Committee noted the steps taken in Spain with a view to the re-organisation of the central authority and the total abolition of regulation of prostitution. It also noted that a bill had been introduced into the Belgian Parliament aiming at the suppression of licensed houses and the abolition of regulation.

3. *Reports of Voluntary Organisations.*—As in preceding years, the Committee noted various reports from representatives of the following voluntary organisations: the *Association catholique internationale des œuvres de protection de la jeune fille*; the International Federation of Girls' Friendly Societies; the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues, the International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children and the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and

Women, and the International Women's Organisations.

It noted with satisfaction the fortunate results obtained by these organisations as regards the suppression of the traffic and the protection of women and children.

4. *Amendments to the 1910 and 1921 Conventions.*—For a number of years the Committee has been studying the possibility of extending the scope of the provisions contained in the International Conventions of 1910 and 1921 in order to allow of a more efficient suppression of the traffic. To this end, it has been studying the elimination of the age-limit and the penalties to be imposed upon *souteneurs*.

(a) *Elimination of the Age-limit.*—The existing conventions punish the traffic in women and children if under twenty-one years of age, whether the victims have consented or not. They provide also for the punishment of the traffic in women who are of age if the traffickers employ fraud, violence, threats or any other method of compulsion or abuse their authority. Traffic in women who are of age, however, is not punishable under the Conventions if such women consent to become victims of the traffic with a full knowledge of facts.

In 1931 the Committee had suggested filling this gap in the existing legislation and had instructed the Secretariat to ask the Governments signatories to the Conventions whether they would be prepared to punish trafficking in women who are of age and consent thereto, by abolishing the age-limit in the 1910 and 1921 Conventions.* Thirty-one Governments sent in replies, thirty of whom declared themselves in principle in favour of the Committee's proposal. In many cases, however, this adhesion was only given subject to certain restrictions contained in national laws and regulations.

After examining the replies the Committee, considering that traffic in women was always and in all circumstances a profoundly immoral and anti-social act, further, that impunity as regards the traffic was hampering the effective suppression of traffic in minors, expressed the view that the traffic in women should be punished even if the victims consented thereto. It asked the Council to approach Governments with a view to obtaining the necessary modification in the Conventions in force and in their national laws.

(b) *Repression of the Activities of Souteneurs.*—In 1931 the Committee drew up an additional draft Protocol to the Conventions on Traffic

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI, No. 4, p. 109

in Women and Children, which provided for the punishment of *souteneurs*.†

This draft was submitted to Governments for their observations. Most of the replies so far received raise no objection to the proposal to add to existing international conventions provisions for the punishment of *souteneurs*. They, nevertheless, point out that at present it might be very difficult to achieve international agreement as to the punishment to be imposed and criminal procedure.

Before discussing the replies, the Committee considered it preferable to wait until all Governments had sent in their answers. To save time, however, it was decided to submit all proposals to the Legal Sub-Committee, which will present a report at the next session. This Sub-Committee will also note communications from private international organisations to which the draft Protocol will be communicated for their opinion.

5. *Central Authorities*.—The Committee considered the organisation and practical work of the central authorities established under Article 1 of the 1904 Agreement on Traffic in Women and Children. It was of opinion that closer contact between the central authorities and the Secretariat was necessary in order to obtain more accurate information on the cases of traffic reported. It also recommended that the Secretariat should maintain close contact with organisations such as the International Criminal Police Commission. It requested the Council to ask Governments to examine the possibility of improving the organisation of their central authorities, of strengthening their power of action and of encouraging their relations with voluntary organisations with a view to rendering their work more efficient.

6. *Women Police*.—The Committee considered the question of women police, and instructed the Secretariat to continue to collect material on the subject.

7. *Repatriation of Prostitutes*.—The Committee noted the report on the repatriation of prostitutes submitted by Madame Paulina Luisi (Uruguay).

The report draws attention to the existence of a strong feeling against any kind of compulsory measure for the repatriation of prostitutes.

Considering that the problem should be further studied, the Committee expressed the opinion that the repatriation of prostitutes raised another question, that of assisting repatriated prostitutes to earn their livelihood in an honest

manner. It instructed Madame Luisi to continue her study.

(b) *Child Welfare*.

1. *Assistance to Destitute Foreigners*.—The Committee studied the composition of a special committee of experts appointed by the Council to study the entire question of assistance to destitute foreigners and that of the recognition and execution of maintenance orders abroad. It was of opinion that the countries of immigration were not sufficiently represented on the Committee and requested the Council to consider the possibility of inviting one of the countries of Western Latin-America to take part in its work.

2. *Report of the Liaison Officer of the International Labour Office*.—This report concerns more particularly the question of the age of admission of children to different forms of non-industrial labour.

The Committee drew the attention of the General Labour Conference, which is considering a preliminary draft Convention on the subject, to the danger inherent in the possibility of giving children light work outside school hours and of thus adding hours of labour to their hours of school work, which may render less effective the protection which the law wishes to afford children.

3. *Report of the Health Organisation*.—The Committee noted the report of the Health Organisation and decided at its next session to study the social rôle of nurses and social welfare workers and the preservation of the health of mothers and children; in 1934 it will study the question of pre-natal centres.

4. *Reports of the Liaison Officers for the International Educational Cinematographic Institute*.—The Committee noted that a considerable part of the work of the Institute was directly or indirectly concerned with child welfare, in view of its bearing upon the education and social training of youth. It recommended that the Institute should publish the results of its inquiries among parents, teachers, and school children in regard to the films preferred by young people and the influence of the cinema on children and young people. It expressed the hope that in its future work the Institute would endeavour to give prominence to the social aspect of cinematographic problems in connection with children and young people, and would continue to take an interest in the production of school films and recreational films especially intended for the young. It asked the Secretariat to complete, with the assistance of the Institute, its inquiry.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 4, p. 109.

regarding the age of the admission of children to exhibitions of cinematographic films.

5. *Blind Children.*—The study of the question of blind children had been referred to a Sub-Committee composed of Madame Estrid Hein, Dr. Humbert, and Dr. Velghe. This Sub-Committee expressed the view that, for teaching purposes, the category of blind children should include those who, owing to defective sight, could not read ordinary school books without great difficulty or danger to vision. The legislative enactments regarding instruction on a compulsory free basis should, it was considered, be extended to such children. The education should preferably be given in institutes for the blind or in schools or classes especially organised for total or partly blind children. Governments should take steps to facilitate the secondary and even higher education of blind adolescents capable of benefiting thereby.

6. *Illegitimate Children.*—The Committee considered the position of illegitimate children, and noted that in numerous countries social insurance tended to grant illegitimate children the same advantages as legitimate children.

Among means of improving the position of illegitimate children the Committee drew attention to compulsory guardianship, official or not, the establishment of paternity, the simplification of formalities and the reduction of the expense of marriage for foreigners, at all events when they did not possess the necessary financial means. It asked the Council to bring these points to the notice of Governments.

7. *Children in Moral and Social Danger.*—The Committee noted reports of Melle Chaptal on the results of her inquiry in England and France. These inquiries, which have been carried out in Germany, England, Canada, Denmark, the United States, France and Italy, are now terminated, and the Committee invited Melle Chaptal to draw up a general report.

8. *Juvenile Courts.*—The Committee prepared a questionnaire concerning institutions for erring or delinquent minors. It further dealt with the organisation and working of juvenile courts. Before drawing up its resolutions, it decided to await the end of the inquiries in this connection, but, nevertheless, at once to express the opinion that all confinement in prison should be absolutely excluded in the case of children; in cases of delinquency the treatment applied to them should be prompted by a desire for their education and training and not for their punishment.

(c) *Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People.*

The two Committees examined, at joint meetings, certain of the questions on their agenda.

1. *Constitution of the Advisory Commission.*—In 1929 the Council had instructed the Commission to examine in 1932 certain questions concerning its own Statute and constitution. The British delegate had been requested to present a report on the subject.

The report recalls the origin, development, and field of activity of the Commission. It examines the question of its complete or partial re-organisation, as well as that of modifications in its methods. It deals with the number and the functions of Government delegates and of the representatives of international voluntary organisations and with the work and position of the Secretariat.

The discussion showed that three different factors were necessary for the efficient working of the Commission: the collaboration of Government delegates representing the views of the various State departments, the collaboration of representatives of public opinion through the agency of important international voluntary organisations, and the assistance of experts specialising in the questions on the agenda. The Commission appointed a Sub-Committee to study modifications and improvements that might be made in the constitution and working of its two committees and instructed it to report next year. This Sub-Committee is composed of Mme. Romniciano (Chairman), M. Regnault, Count Carton de Wiart, Madame Bäumer, Mlle Gourd, Mlle Dalmazzo, and M. Cohen.

2. *Publicity.*—In 1931 the Commission observed that the inquiries and work of its two Committees were not sufficiently known to the public and did not appear to reach the circles directly concerned. It accordingly instructed the Secretariat to submit suggestions for improving its publicity.

The Secretariat's report recalls the difficulty of interesting the daily press in questions which are not always topical; it proposes to seek the assistance of the technical organisations dealing with social questions, to make use of broadcasting and lectures, and to approach reviews and newspapers interested in such problems.

The Committee adopted a resolution by which its members express their readiness to co-operate with the Secretariat by communicating a list of authors interested in social questions and willing to publish articles in weekly or monthly

reviews; if necessary, to write articles themselves based on the reports and resolutions of the annual session; and, finally, to send the Secretariat a list of periodicals which may appear to them most suitable from the point of view of satisfactory publicity.

3. *Adoption and Exploitation of Children.*—The Commission invited the British representative to make a preliminary report at the next session of the Child Welfare Committee on the various aspects of adoption, the systems in force and their results.

After noting this report the Child Welfare Committee will be able to decide whether a thorough study should be made of the question.

(c) *Traffic in Women and Children in the East.*

The League Commission of Inquiry into the Traffic in Women and Children in the East returned to Geneva early in April, after eighteen months' absence in the East.*

It will be recalled that an inquiry into the international traffic in women had already been carried out in Europe, the Mediterranean basin and the Americas in 1924 and 1925 by a body of experts also appointed by the League.

For the purpose of the earlier inquiry, international traffic was taken as meaning, primarily, the direct or indirect procurement and transportation of women and children to a foreign country for immoral purposes. This definition also covers certain cases of procuring women as entertainers and artistes and exploiting them for purposes of prostitution in foreign countries, often under degrading and demoralising conditions.

The Commission of Experts for the East governed its work by a similar definition. The Commission was also instructed to take into account special conditions and customs prevailing in the various Eastern countries. International traffic in women, being not merely a problem in criminology, but having also its social and economic aspect, being sometimes related to domestic customs, to migratory movements of populations and to famine conditions, all these aspects were to be covered by the Commission's inquiry.

The Commission visited Siam, Indo-China, Hongkong, Macao, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan, the Dutch East Indies, the Straits Settlements and the Federated and Unfederated Malay States, India, Pondicherry, Ceylon, Persia, Iraq, Syria and the Lebanon, and Palestine.

Almost everywhere the chief officials of the Police and Passport Departments, Immigration and Health Officials and Judges of various courts gave evidence before the Commission. As regards private individuals and non-Government organisations, the Commission obtained valuable information from the heads of religious communities, from missionaries and from various social organisations, prominent among which were women's associations. In some towns investigations were carried out on the spot.

The material collected in this way will constitute the basis for the Commission's report, the drafting of which is now being undertaken and which will be published after submission to the Governments concerned and organs of the League.

2. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

Fifteenth Session of the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs opened its fifteenth session on April 15th at Geneva.

M. de Vasconcellos (Portugal) welcomed the new members of the Committee: namely, M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), M. Hoo Chi Tsai (China), Mr. Fuller (United States), M. Obradovitch (Yugoslavia), M. Sawada (Japan), and M. Martinez de Alva (Mexico).

The Committee then elected its Chairman and Vice-Chairman. On the proposal of M. Casares (Spain), M. Bourgois (France), was elected Chairman and on the proposal of M. Cavazzoni (Italy), M. Casares was elected Vice-Chairman.

The agenda includes the progress report of the Secretariat; annual reports on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs; certain questions raised in connection with the Convention for the Limitation of Manufacture and Regulation of Distribution of Drugs (co-operation of the Committee in the supervisory organisation; co-operation of the Committee in the work of the Committee of Experts); the recommendations contained in the Final Act of the 1931 Conference (preparation of a model code; convention for the prosecution and punishment of violators of the narcotic drugs legislation; possibility of applying the international control system provided by the Geneva Convention to any preparation containing any one of the drugs included in Group 1, whatever the drug percentage may be); work of the Bangkok Conference, in particular certain recommendations in the Final Act referred to the Committee by the Council (co-operation of the Committee in scientific research with regard to the question of opium smoking and the prepara-

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. X., No. 8, p. 154.

tion of a model annual report on the control of opium smoking).

[Other points for discussion are the preparation of a conference for the limitation and supervision of poppy growing, and the cultivation and harvesting of the coca leaf; illicit traffic and reports of seizures, the position in Turkey and in the Near East; a proposal of the Uruguayan Government that drug consignments shall bear a number corresponding to that of the export certificates, extension of the serial numbering system to drug containers sent by wholesale merchants; the chartering of vessels by foreigners; illicit traffic by air; rôle of forwarding agents; model black list to be prepared by the Secretariat; the situation in China as regards drugs; concerted action between China and the Treaty Powers; annual reports on the traffic in dangerous drugs for foreign settlements in China); an inquiry

regarding drug addiction, consumption statistics, &c.

The Committee was composed as follows: Dr. Bruno Schultz (Austria), M. Carnoy (Belgium), M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), T. W. Russel Pacha (Egypt), M. Bourgois (France), Dr. Kahler (Germany), Sir Malcolm Delevingne (Great Britain), Sir John Campbell (India), M. Cavazzoni (Italy), M. Sawada (Japan), M. Salvador Martinez de Alva (Mexico), M. W. G. van Wettum (Netherlands), M. Chodzko (Poland), Dr. A. de Vasconcellos (Portugal), Prince Damras (Siam), M. Julio Casares (Spain), Dr. Carriere (Switzerland), Mr. Stuart J. Fuller (United States—appointed by his Government in an unofficial capacity), M. Alfredo de Castro (Uruguay), and M. Obradovitch (Yugoslavia).

A full account of the proceedings will be given in the next number of the MONTHLY SUMMARY.

II.—OTHER QUESTIONS.

I. VISIT OF THE EMIR FEISUL.

His Royal Highness the Emir Feisul, son of the King of Hedjaz and Viceroy of Mecca, accompanied by his suite, visited the League Secretariat on Saturday, April 30th. He was received by the Under-Secretary-General in Charge of Internal Administration, the Marquis Paulucci di Calboli Barone.

The Emir Feisul first visited the Treaty Registry and then proceeded to the new Committee Building of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, where he was received by the Secretary-General,

Sir Eric Drummond, and attended a meeting of the Assembly.

2. THE SUPERVISORY COMMISSION.

The Supervisory Commission met on April 25th to examine the budget of the various League Organisations for 1933, the audited accounts for 1931 and various financial and administrative questions.

The Commission was composed as follows: M. Stefan Osusky, Lord Meston of Agra, M. C. Parra-Perez, M. C. J. Hambro, M. J. Reveillad, and M. de Modzelewsky.

X.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

May 30th.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Automobiles, Geneva.

June 2nd.—Economic Committee, Geneva.

June 6th.—Sub-Committee of Experts on Customs Nomenclature, Geneva.

July 12th.—Delegation of Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth, Geneva.

July 15th.—Executive and Directors' Committee of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

July 18th.—Fourteenth plenary session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and Ninth Session of the Governing Body of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

September 5th.—Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva.

October 17th.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. SESSIONS OF THE COURT.

The twenty-fifth (extraordinary session of the Court began on April 18th. In the list for the session is entered the case concerning the Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex (third phase).

For this session the Court is, in accordance with Article 13 of the Statute, constituted in principle in the same way as in October-December, 1930, when it dealt with the second phase of the case of the Free Zones.

Its composition, however, is not identical, as one of the judges who then sat has since died. The Court therefore is constituted as follows: M. Anzilotti—who presided over the Court in 1930—acting as President (Italy), M. Loder (Holland), M. Altamira (Spain), M. Oda (Japan), M. Huber (Switzerland), Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain), M. Kellogg (United States), M. Yovanovitch (Yugoslavia), M. Beichmann (Norway), M. Negulesco (Roumania), M. Eugène Dreyfus (France), judge *ad hoc*.

2. FREE ZONES OF UPPER SAVOY AND THE DISTRICT OF GEX.

The hearings in this case, which has been brought before the Court by the French and Swiss Governments and which has already formed the subject of two Orders (the first of which was made on August 19th, 1929, and the second on December 6th, 1930) opened on April 19th. At the beginning of the first hearing, M. Anzilotti indicated the circumstances in which the Court was once more taking up the case and in which the proceedings were to be continued.

In the course of public sittings held on April 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th, the Court has heard the oral arguments submitted by M. Basdevant, on behalf of the French Government, and by M. Logoz on behalf of the Swiss Government.

On April 29th, M. Anzilotti declared the hearings at an end whilst reserving the Court's right, should it see fit, to call for any further information it might require.

The Court is now deliberating upon its judgment.

3. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND.

The Norwegian Government has appointed as counsel and advocate in this case—in addi-

tion to M. Sunde—M. Gilbert Charles Gidel, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris and at the *Ecole libre des Sciences politiques*.

4. INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE OF MEMEL.

On April 11th, the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan filed with the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice an application instituting proceedings against the Lithuanian Government.

In this application, which is based on Article 17 of the Convention concerning the Memel territory, concluded between these five Governments and signed at Paris on May 8th, 1924, the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan refer to the dismissal of the President of the Memel Directorate, M. Boettcher, the appointment of a Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis and the dissolution of the Diet. These acts have given rise to differences of opinion as to whether they are in accordance with the Statute of the Memel Territory which is annexed to the Convention of May 8th, 1924. As these differences of opinion have not been reconciled either by the inquiry conducted by the Council or by negotiations between the Powers Signatories of the Convention of May 8th, 1924, the Applicant Parties ask the Court to decide six questions, which are formulated in the application as follows:

(1) Whether the Governor of the Memel Territory has the right to dismiss the President of the Directorate;

(2) In the case of an affirmative decision, whether this right only exists under certain conditions or in certain circumstances, and what those conditions or circumstances are;

(3) If the right to dismiss the President of the Directorate is admitted, whether such dismissal involves the termination of the appointments of the other members of the Directorate;

(4) If the right to dismiss the President of the Directorate only exists under certain conditions or in certain circumstances, whether the dismissal of M. Boettcher, carried out on February 6th, 1932, is in order in the circumstances in which it took place;

(5) Whether, in the circumstances in which it took place, the appointment of the Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis is in order;

(6) Whether the dissolution of the Diet, carried out by the Governor of the Memel Territory on March 22nd, 1932, when the Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis had not received the confidence of the Diet, is in order.

* This article has been compiled on the basis of information from the Registry of the Court.

The French Government has appointed as its Agent M. Basdevant, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris and Legal Adviser to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, His Britannic Majesty's Government in Great Britain has appointed as its Agents Sir William Malkin, K.C., Count Senni, Italian Minister at The Hague, and M. Matsunaga, Japanese Minister at The Hague have been appointed by their respective Governments temporarily to act as Agents. The Lithuanian Government has appointed M. Sidzikauskas, Lithuanian Minister in London.

By an Order made on April 16th, the President of the Court fixed the time-limits for the written proceedings as follows: for the presentation by the Applicant Governments of their Memorial May 2nd, 1932, for the presentation by the Respondent Government of its Counter-Memorial May 30th, 1932. The Applicant Governments having waived their right to present a written reply, the Respondent Government's right to present a rejoinder becomes redundant. Under the Order, the case will be ready for hearing by the Court in the course of the month of June.

Availing himself of the right conferred upon it by Article 31 of the Court's Statute, the Lithuanian Government has appointed as judge *ad hoc* to sit in the Court for this case, M. Michel Römeris, Professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Vytautas-the-Great at Kovno.

The Memorial of the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan was duly filed on April 30th, 1932. The Memorial contains formal submissions on the points above mentioned.

5. OPTIONAL CLAUSE.

The instrument of the ratification by the Government of Peru of the Protocol of Signature concerning the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and of the Declaration of adhesion by Peru to the Optional Clause provided in this Protocol were deposited at the League Secretariat on March 29th, 1932.

6. COMMUNICATION OF TREATIES.

Since October 1st the following treaties and agreements have been filed with the Registry:

Date of Filing.	Nature of Instrument.	Date of Signature.	Signatories.
October 6th, 1931 ..	Treaty of Conciliation and Arbitration.	26.1.31	Austria and Hungary.
November 2nd, 1931 .	Convention Concerning the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes.	27.6.30	Iceland and Sweden.
November 5th, 1931 .	Treaty of Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.	30.3.31	Spain and Netherlands.
November 10th, 1931.	Treaty of Arbitration and Conciliation.	11.9.29	Germany and Luxemburg.
November 18th, 1931.	Convention for Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation.	17.3.31	Czechoslovakia and Turkey.
November 18th, 1931.	Convention for Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement.	18.4.31	Turkey and Belgium.
November 18th, 1931.	Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Arbitration.	3.2.31	France and Turkey.
November 18th, 1931.	Treaty of Arbitration and Conciliation.	16.5.29	Germany and Turkey.
November 18th, 1931.	Treaty of Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.	28.4.30	Spain and Turkey.

Date of Filing.	Nature of Instrument.	Date of Signature.	Signatories.
November 18th, 1931.	Treaty of Friendship, Neutrality, Conciliation and Arbitration.	30.10.30	Greece and Turkey.
November 18th, 1931.	Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.	6.3.29	Bulgaria and Turkey.
November 26th, 1931.	Treaty of Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.	25.10.28	Belgium and Poland.
November 26th, 1931.	Treaty of Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.	31.12.29	Bulgaria and Poland.
December 3rd, 1931 .	Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement.	26.6.30	Austria and Greece.
December 3rd, 1931 .	Convention Concerning Establishment of Commerce and Navigation.	22.8.31	Austria and Roumania.
December 3rd, 1931 .	Convention for the Final Settlement of Questions Resulting from Sections III. and IV. of Part X. of the Treaty of St. Germain.	18.1.30	Austria and Belgium.
December 14th, 1931.	Convention of Commerce . . .	8.7.29	France and Switzerland.
December 14th, 1931.	Treaty of Commerce . . .	26.8.29	The Economic Union between Belgium and Luxemburg- Switzerland.
December 14th, 1931.	Convention Concerning the Bank for International Settlements.	20.1.30	Switzerland, Ger- many, Belgium, etc.
December 14th, 1931.	Treaty of Commerce . . .	26.5.30	Netherlands and Switzerland.
December 14th, 1931.	Treaty of Friendship and Commerce.	28.5.31	Siam and Switzerland.
December 14th, 1931.	Convention Concerning the Establishment in Switzerland of the Agrarian Fund.	21.8.31	Switzerland, France, etc.
December 14th, 1931.	Convention Concerning the Establishment in Switzerland of a Special Fund.	21.8.31	Switzerland, France, etc.
December 17th, 1931.	Protocol Bestowing upon the Court Jurisdiction to Construe The Hague Conventions of Private International Law.	27.3.31	Austria, Belgium, etc

Date of Filing.	Nature of Instrument.	Date of Signature.	Signatories.
December 17th, 1931.	Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.	21.6.30	Denmark and Lithuania.
December 17th, 1931.	Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.	31.10.31	Denmark and Netherlands.
December 17th, 1931.	Treaty of Commerce	9.11.31	Denmark and Bolivia.
December 28th, 1931.	Treaty of Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation.	22.1.30	Netherlands and Roumania
January 2nd, 1932 .	Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.	6.8.30	Great Britain and Roumania.
January 2nd, 1932 .	Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.	31.7.31	Albania and Great Britain.
January 2nd, 1932 .	Convention Respecting Air Transport Services.	17.4.31	Great Britain and Greece.
January 8th, 1932 .	Convention for Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement.	29.4.30	Belgium and Lithuania.
January 14th, 1932 .	Treaty of Friendship	17.2.29	Germany and Persia.
January 15th, 1932 .	Treaty of Conciliation and Judicial Settlement.	28.4.31	Italy and Latvia.
January 15th, 1932 .	Treaty of Conciliation and Arbitration	24.11.30	Latvia and Lithuania.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly).

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 5s. \$1.25

4. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual):

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (*Trilingual*) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

9. I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual).

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

Colour Vision Tests. 47 pp.	2s. 0d.	\$0.50
*Unemployment and Public Works. 186 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. xii + 263 pp.	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky. v + 212 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930. iv + 692 pp.	16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building. xii + 318 pp.	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation. vii + 381 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene. vii + 188 pp.	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	8s. 0d.	\$2.00
	6s. 0d.	\$1.50

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopedia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)

	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
Volume edition (in two volumes)	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
		£3 10s. 0d.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN
Mr. M. R. K. BURGE,
12, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.1.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
Sowest, London.)
Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)

U.S.A.
American Sales Agents:
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, Jount Vernon Street,
Boston 9, Mass.

JAPAN
Mr. J. ASARI,
Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya
Park, Kojimachiku,
Tokio. (Telegrams:
Kokusairodo, Tokio.)
Telephone: Ginza 1580.)

INDIA
Mr. P. P. PILLAI,
International Labour Office
(Indian Branch)
New Delhi.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
New Delhi.)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

TAXATION OF FOREIGN AND NATIONAL ENTERPRISES in France, Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States of America

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II. A.3)

275 pages **Price : 10s. \$2.50**

This volume contains the first authoritative survey dealing specially with taxation in France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, and the United States of America of individuals and companies having interests or carrying on business in more than one country.

All the various questions connected with this subject are examined, including the taxation of each different kind of income (interest, dividends, rents, royalties, commercial and industrial profits, etc.) which may be derived from the above-named countries or elsewhere. A full account is also given of the manner in which the income of all kinds of foreign or national enterprises (commercial, industrial, banking, insurance, mining, transport, etc.) is assessed for taxation purposes in each of these countries.

This survey should be of great utility to banking, industrial, and commercial concerns, insurance companies, holding companies, chartered accountants, etc. as well as to the business community in general.

REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE TO THE COUNCIL on the Work of its Forty-fifth Session (Paris, March 3rd-24th, 1932)

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II., A.5)

19 pages **Price : 9d. \$0.20**

Appendices on Bulgaria

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II., A.6)

23 pages **Price : 9d. \$0.20**

Appendices on Greece

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II., A.7)

13 pages **Price : 9d. \$0.15**

The Committee deals in this report with the serious financial situation—and above all the urgent transfer problem—of Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, and Hungary, and recommends that in order to meet the crisis, a loan, bearing the collective guarantee of a number of Governments, should be raised for these countries. A special meeting of the Council of the League has been convened to consider this report.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF AUSTRIA Quarterly Reports

By M. ROST VAN TONNINGEN, the Representative in Austria of the
Financial Committee

First Report (October-December 1931)

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II., A.2)

27 pages **Price : 1s. 3d. \$0.30**

FINANCIAL POSITION OF HUNGARY Quarterly Reports

By MR. ROYALL TYLER, the Representative in Hungary of the Financial
Committee.

First Report (October-December 1931)

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, II., A.1)

27 pages **Price : 1s. 3d. \$0.30**

These reports, which are to be submitted every quarter to the Financial Committee of the League, give regular up to date information on the financial and economic situation of Austria and Hungary.

Complete catalogue sent free on application.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS, PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT, GENEVA

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 5.

MAY, 1932

Sixty-Seventh Session
of the Council.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 5.

MAY, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, May, 1932</i>	146	IX. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions :</i>	
II. <i>Reduction of Armaments :</i>		1. Traffic in Opium	168
1. Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments	146	2. Traffic in Women and Children	171
2. The Prevention of War	147	3. Child Welfare	171
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		4. Slavery :	
Unification of Penal Law	148	(a) Information on Slavery	171
IV. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		(b) Committee of Experts on Slavery	171
1. The Health Organisation :		(c) Contribution to Expenditure of the Committee of Experts on Slavery	172
Popular Nutrition in Chile	148	5. Russian Refugees of German Origin	172
2. The Economic and Financial Organisation :		X. <i>Budget and Financial Questions :</i>	
(a) Financial Situation of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Greece	148	Expenses of the League	172
(b) Bulgarian 1926 and 1928 Loans	154	XI. <i>Other Questions :</i>	
(c) The International Labour Conference and the World Crisis	154	1. Obituary: Tribute to the Memory of the President of the French Republic, of M. Albert Thomas, Director of the International Labour Office, and of M. Inukai, Prime Minister of Japan	175
(d) The Motor-Car Industry	154	2. Appointments	176
3. Communications and Transit :		XII. <i>Publications and Library Questions :</i>	
(a) Public Works	154	Annotated Bibliography of the Principal Volumes on the League catalogued in the League Library from January	176
(b) Air Transport Co-operation.	155	to May, 1932	176
V. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>		XIII. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	178
Committee on Arts and Letters	156		
VI. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>			
1. Danzig	156		
2. Mandates	158		
VII. <i>Protection of Minorities :</i>			
1. In Upper Silesia	160		
2. In Poland	161		
3. In Roumania	163		
VIII. <i>Political Questions :</i>			
1. Appeal of the Chinese Govern- ment	163		
2. The Liberian Request for Assist- ance	164		
3. Claim of the Finnish Govern- ment against the British Government	167		
4. Greco-Bulgarian Emigration	168		

The Permanent Court of International Justice.

1. Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex 179
2. Legal Status of certain parts of Eastern Greenland 179
3. Interpretation of the Statute of Memel 179
4. Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 concerning the Employment of Women during the Night 179
5. " Prince of Pless Administration " 179

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

May, 1932.

The principal League event of May was the sixty-seventh session of the Council, with its important discussions on the financial situation and the termination of the mandate régime in Iraq.

Other questions dealt with at this meeting concerned the Liberian Government's appeal for assistance, Danzig, the protection of minorities, Greco-Bulgarian inter-migration, a series of social questions, the claim of the Finnish Government (concerning Finnish vessels used during the war by the British Government), and a memorandum of the British Government on League expenditure.

As regards the Sino-Japanese dispute, the League was informed of the conclusion of an armistice agreement at Shanghai, and of the progressive withdrawal of the Japanese troops.

The various technical commissions (Land, Naval, Air, National Defence Expenditure, Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons) of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments continued their work with a

view to determining the categories of arms to be covered by measures of qualitative disarmament. The General Commission held a single meeting, on May 10th. The Permanent Advisory Commission on Naval, Military and Air Questions forwarded to the Council a set of regulations for the application of Article 4 of the General Convention to improve Means of Preventing War (functioning of Commissions of Investigation).

The annual session of the Opium Advisory Committee came to an end on May 4th, when the Committee adopted a report which was forwarded to the Council. Other meetings which took place during the month concerned the question of slavery, the unification of penal law, air transport co-operation, and the motor-car industry.

* * *

The League suffered a great loss in the person of M. Albert Thomas, Director of the International Labour Office, who died in Paris on May 7th.

II.—REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

1. CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments held one meeting, on May 10th.

On the proposal of the Bureau of the Conference a Special Committee to reply, as regards chemical and bacteriological weapons and methods of warfare, to the questions asked on April 22nd by the General Commission, with a view to the determination of the arms to be included in qualitative disarmament. This Committee was composed of representatives of the following States: Australia, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

Further, the General Commission, on the proposal of the American delegation, instructed a technical Committee to study all relevant information concerning figures on effectives, with a view to preparing a report on the numerical strength of the effectives maintained by each country, computed on a comparable basis. This Committee included representatives of the following States: Argentine, Belgium,

France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland, Switzerland, Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, United Kingdom, and United States of America. It was understood that when studying the figures presented by States it would invite the representatives of these countries to be present.

* * *

The *Land Commission* considered the replies of its technical Committee to the questionnaires on artillery material* and on armoured vehicles.

On the conclusions drawn from these replies it established for the General Commission a report on artillery material. The discussion on armed vehicles is continuing.

* * *

The *Naval Commission* continued its general discussion until May 9th. After sitting as a drafting committee, it adopted, on May 27th, a report replying to the questions put in the resolution of the General Commission of April 22nd.† This report begins with the general section and then deals successively with capital ships, aircraft carriers, submarines, automatic contact mines, river war-craft.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 120.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 119.

The *Commission on National Defence Expenditure* dealt, more particularly, with the following questions: the possibility of comparing the strength of the armaments of the various countries according to their expenditure; meaning and scope of the term "national defence"; classification of national defence expenditure and methods for detailed publicity of such expenditure; fluctuations in the purchasing power of currencies.

Each of these problems raises a series of questions of which most were studied by the Committee of Experts in Budget Questions. They were referred for a detailed study to a technical committee presided over by Radulesco (Roumania). This Committee appointed the following rapporteurs: M. Jacomet (France), on budget systems; M. Worbs (Germany), on general questions; M. Sandler (Sweden), on universality of expenditure; M. Lyon (Great Britain), on classification of expenditure; and General Barberis (Italy), on the annexed tables.

So far, in accordance with its rules of procedure, the Committee has begun its examination of material deposited by the following countries: Switzerland, the United Kingdom, India, Sweden, France, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Germany, Belgium, and the United States.

* * *

The *Special Committee on Effectives*, appointed on May 10th, elected M. de Brouckère (Belgium) as Chairman, and decided to take its work in the following order:

1. Definition of the terms "effectives," "officer," "professional soldier," "conscription soldier," "militia men," "reservist," etc.

2. Examination of the effectives of the land, sea and air forces mentioned in the information addressed by Governments to the League and, if necessary, rectification of these figures according to the definitions adopted, with a view to placing them on a comparable basis.

3. Establishment of a table giving these modified figures.

4. Examination of the interpretations of the terms "formations organised on a military basis," taking as starting point replies furnished by Governments.

5. Definition of the terms used regarding formations organised on a military basis.

6. Examination of the figures given for these forces and, if necessary, rectification of these figures.

7. Establishment of a table of these forces.

8. Report.

A*

The *Special Committee on Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare*, which met for the first time on May 18th, elected M. Pilotti (Italy) as Chairman and M. Rutgers (Netherlands) as rapporteur. It considered the question of bacteriological weapons, chemical weapons, incendiary projectiles, and flame projectors.

2. THE PREVENTION OF WAR.

The Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air Questions, which met at Geneva on April 22nd and 23rd, to prepare, with the assistance of the Legal Adviser of the Secretariat and the Secretary-General of the Transit Organisation, draft regulations for the execution of Article 4 of the General Convention to Improve Means of Preventing War,* finished its work on May 3rd, and forwarded to the Council the required draft regulations.

On May 18th the Council, on the report of the Spanish representative, M. de Madariaga, approved the regulations, which were forwarded to the Governments of the States invited to the Disarmament Conference.

Before the vote the rapporteur drew attention to the fact that the Commission had expressed the opinion that it was essential that the experts, who were to serve on the Commissions of Inspection, should be appointed as quickly as possible when their services were required. M. de Madariaga expressed the conviction that Governments would, at all times, be willing to sanction, with the utmost despatch, the appointment of one of their nationals as commissioner. He further mentioned that the General Convention had been ratified by Peru and signed by nineteen other States. The ratification of the Convention by all Members of the League would, he said, appreciably strengthen the feeling of security without which very little result could be expected from the Disarmament Conference.

The German representative pointed out, in connection with measures relating to air forces contained in the regulations, that several delegations, including the German delegation, had placed before the Disarmament Conference proposals for the complete abolition of the air arm, and that the Council's approval of the regulations in no way prejudged the fate of the proposals in question.

The French representative said that his country was only deferring its ratification of the Convention until the regulations had been

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, p. 276.

approved by the Council, and until it saw what signatures or ratifications had already been given. The French Government would desire that there should always be ready a list of experts proposed by Governments, so that the

Council could make its selection under conditions more favourable to rapidity. It drew the Council's attention to the recommendation of the Commission regarding the prompt designation of experts.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

UNIFICATION OF PENAL LAW.

In accordance with a resolution of the Twelfth Assembly,* a meeting of representatives of the more important international organisations dealing with the problem of criminality was held at Geneva in May. The object of this meeting was to indicate how the League might be able to co-operate in the unification of penal law and promote collaboration between States in combating crime.

The organisations represented were: the International Penal Law Association, the International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, the International Criminal Police Commission, the Howard League for Penal Reform, the International Law Association,

and the International Union of Penal Law.

The Conference, which was presided over, first, by M. Bumke, President of the *Reichsgericht*, and then by Count Carton de Wiart, Belgian Minister of State, adopted a report which will be submitted for ratification by the above organisations. This report contemplates the possibility of League co-operation with international organisations for the unification of penal law by means of international conventions to be recommended to States for adoption. These conventions might bear upon the unification of the fundamental rules of penal law, extradition regulations, police co-operation, etc. When drawing up Conventions the League may seek the assistance of certain international organisations mentioned in the report.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

1. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

Popular Nutrition in Chile.

The question of popular nutrition in Chile came before the Council on May 9th, when it considered a letter dated March 16th, 1932, from M. Valdes-Mendeville, Minister Plenipotentiary and Head of the Chilean Permanent Delegation to the League, in which his Government requested the co-operation of the League Technical Organisations and, in particular, of the Health Organisation, for a study of this question.

The Council requested the League Health Committee and the Economic Committee to consider and report upon this request, and asked the Chilean Government to give these Committees such information as might be of use for the preliminary study of the question.

2. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Financial Situation of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Greece.*

The general section of the report of the Financial Committee on the work of its forty-fifth session was considered by the Council

at two meetings on May 21st, in conjunction with a letter of appeal from the Austrian Government.

It will be remembered that at the preliminary discussion of April 12th the British, French, German and Italian representatives had asked that before drawing a conclusion the report should be studied by their experts.† This examination now being terminated, the Council began by hearing the British, French, German and Italian representatives.

The British representative said that the point in the report with which the four Governments were particularly concerned was the recommendation that they should endeavour to avert an intensification of the crisis by guaranteeing loans, the proceeds of which should be placed at the disposal of certain countries of Central and South Eastern Europe. The Financial Committee did not suggest that such loans would provide a lasting cure for the economic and financial difficulties of the borrowers; it envisaged them as temporary measures of assistance to enable the borrowers to obtain a respite pending a general improvement in the world situation. From the point of view of the lenders, therefore, the loans would

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, p. 273.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 121.

be a speculation which the lending Governments, whose primary responsibility was their own taxpayers, would find it hard to justify. On the other hand, from the point of view of the borrowers, the loans would be in the nature of League loans and would, in the long run, prove an increased source of weakness owing to the increase in their external indebtedness.

It had been pointed out that the difficulties from which these countries were suffering arose, in the main, from world causes, but the Financial Committee had not formulated precise recommendations as to measures to remedy these difficulties. The report did not indicate how exchange controls and import restrictions, which were progressively strangling trade in these countries, were to be gradually abrogated, or how confidence in the countries was to be revised and freedom restored to the monetary system.

The British Government thought it undesirable to encourage certain countries to expect external financial help; they should be urged, rather, to rely on their own endeavours, directed by such expert advice as the League could give. The British Government had reached the conclusion that it could not ask its legislature for authority to guarantee loans to afford temporary assistance in accordance with the recommendations of the Financial Committee, and the British representative understood that the French, German, and Italian Governments were at one with the British Government in that policy.

The British Government considered, however, that one country, Austria, had special claims to external aid, as she had been passing through a period in which she had had to adjust herself to the new situation created by the Peace Treaties. Last summer it had been hoped that Austria would be in a position to issue a loan. When that proved impossible the Bank of England made an advance to the Austrian Government of which one hundred million schillings were still outstanding. Hopes had been held out that similar assistance might be forthcoming from other countries, but they had not been realised. The first necessity was to provide the Austrian National Bank with sufficient foreign currency to maintain confidence and to give the Bank the necessary freedom of action. This would be most readily provided by the grant to Austria by other countries of a credit similar to that granted by Great Britain. If this were not practicable, it might be necessary to contemplate special measures on the part of the principal Governments to facilitate the issue of a loan by the

Austrian Government of an amount sufficient to strengthen the reserves of the National Bank, after repaying the balance of the advance made by the Bank of England. In this case the British Government would be ready to take part in an international scheme for giving such aid to Austria, and would facilitate the issue on the British market of an amount sufficient to repay the advance of the Bank of England, thus making it possible for the amounts raised in other countries to be available for strengthening the reserves of the Bank.

The British Government's contribution to such a scheme was, of course, conditional upon the Austrian Government continuing to honour its obligations on its external state debt and, in particular, the guaranteed loan issued under the League's auspices in 1923. The British Government profoundly regretted that it was not possible to inform the Council that agreement had been reached between the four Powers upon such a scheme as that outlined.

The British representative, further, noted that, in a letter addressed to the Council, the Austrian Government expressed serious doubts as to its ability to continue to meet its obligations to provide foreign exchange for its external debt. The British Government fully recognised Austria's difficulties, but felt bound to remind her of the circumstances in which the League had assisted her in 1923 and of the very special position of the guaranteed loan issued under the League's auspices. The British Government would take the most serious view of any failure to carry out the obligations in connection with this loan, and must earnestly press the Austrian Government to do all in its power to carry out such obligations integrally and punctually.

Referring to other foreign loans raised by various Governments under the League's auspices, the British representative drew attention to the fact that the Greek Government, without reaching prior agreement with its bond-holders, had failed to pay the coupons due on May 1st in respect of the Greek 7 per cent. Refugee Loan, 1924. At its April meeting the Council had stated that any temporary alleviation required must be discussed strictly between the debtor Governments and their creditors. The Council as a whole had a special responsibility in regard to this loan, and certain individual members represented on the International Financial Commission at Athens had a further responsibility. The British Government, in virtue of its double responsibility, expressed its deep regret that Greece should have failed to carry out her obligations towards her creditors, the League, and the Governments

represented on the Financial Commission. The record of Greece had, in the past, stood so high that the British Government ventured to express the hope that the Greek Government would lose no time in responding to this appeal.

The French representative, M. Paul-Boncour, said that his Government had not awaited the examination of the report of the Financial Committee to deal with the difficulties of Danubian Europe. More than two months previously his Government had placed before the three other Governments concerned proposals which, in its view, were the only ones calculated to overcome the crisis. The French Government was convinced that there was not a financial crisis distinguishable from an economic crisis; the whole matter in its two-fold aspect should be examined and, if possible, solved. Experience and the failure of previous experiments had convinced the French Government that only comprehensive solutions could provide a remedy for the present situation.

In this spirit the French Government had taken up and codified a previous proposal of the British Government. It had recommended the establishment between the Danubian States of a preferential tariff system, which it considered of a nature to revive trade in that region and thus improve the balance of payments and increase the revenue of the States concerned. This plan had a further advantage, by creating conditions in which the crisis would be overcome, it would permit of establishing a definition for that general financial action without which it was vain to hope that the present crisis would be surmounted. To recommend new loans while doing nothing to revive economic activity would be absolutely useless.

Speaking of the financial assistance already afforded to several of the countries dealt with in the Financial Committee's report, the French representative expressed the view that no further operation of any importance could be undertaken without the guarantee of the Governments whose nationals would eventually be called upon to provide the funds, but he thought it impossible for any Government to undertake that responsibility unless it could prove that all the conditions necessary for effective action were fulfilled.

The French Government considered that exceptional financial action on a wide scale was necessary to give the beneficiaries the freedom and the time required to lay down suitable foundations for a sound economic and financial policy. The principal European powers could together guarantee the constitution of a fund intended in the first place to

re-establish confidence in the beneficiaries. The administration of the fund would be ensured for strictly temporary purposes by a body unaffected by political considerations and regarded as competent to prepare the technical methods and conditions of the proposed operations.

In the case of Austria, action on the above basis would, he thought, meet her requirements, as it would provide an assurance that an effort on her behalf would not be nullified by an extension of the difficulties in the other Danubian countries.

The French representative associated himself, generally speaking, with the considerations advanced by the British representative in regard to certain financial measures taken by the Greek Government. While unable to appreciate the very serious reasons which had compelled the Greek Government to have recourse to the steps it had taken, the French representative endorsed the hope that an agreement would be concluded with the bond-holders without delay.

The Italian representative, M. Scialoja, said that his country, in virtue of her geographical situation adjacent to the countries in question, had invariably been among the first to endeavour to contribute effectively to the revival of Austria and Hungary. His Government considered that the measures best calculated to improve the situation were those aiming at an improvement in conditions of agriculture and industrial production; the Italian Government believed that each country should be considered individually.

This did not mean that it rejected the idea of a broad measure of co-operation among all the countries concerned; on the contrary, it regarded this as indispensable, but thought that at the same time each individual case must be examined on its merits and within its own special limits. The natural movement of exchanges should be facilitated, and everything calculated to hamper or divert such movements from the normal channel should be avoided.

Speaking of the situation in Central and South Eastern Europe, the Italian representative voiced the conviction that the complete recovery of these countries could only come as the result of a general revival, the essential factors in which should be sought primarily in the settlement of international debts, in the abolition of trade restrictions, in the return of confidence, and the reawakening of initiative. To meet immediate needs Italy had concluded agreements with Austria and Hungary, and was ready to take part with other countries in any

action that would meet the more immediate requirements of the financial situation in Austria.

The German representative, Count Welzeck, agreed with the statements made by the representatives of the three other Governments which had taken part in the examination of the Financial Committee's report, but considered that the guarantees proposed could only be given provided the loans were calculated to enable the beneficiaries effectively and permanently to overcome their economic and financial difficulties. To remove those difficulties a far broader basis of action would have to be taken. As regards the Danubian countries, what was required first and foremost was to combine and create an economic basis of such a nature that the countries concerned would in future have no need of relief from abroad. The settlement of the problem was indissolubly linked up with the questions dealt with in the Financial Committee's report, since the object in view was to come as rapidly as possible to the rescue of the afflicted countries, while, at the same time, minimising the sacrifices of the countries obliged to go to their assistance. Count Welzeck further pointed out that, while appreciating that it was necessary and right that each country should rely upon its own resources for overcoming the economic and financial difficulties, the present position in the Danubian countries was due to the world crisis, and, consequently, could not be remedied unless a remedy was found at the same time for the universal cause of that crisis. The Financial Committee had indicated as a first important step the need for immediate action in the matter of international debts.

The German Government admitted that, without prejudice to its attitude of principle with regard to the question of guaranteed loans, there might be certain cases in which temporary financial assistance from abroad became necessary for preserving a country from having to take measures the consequences of which might have serious repercussions in other countries. A situation of that nature arose in the case of Austria, who had again applied to the League.

The German Government was prepared to co-operate in considering any appropriate measures of financial relief and preventing a fresh aggravation of the position.

The Council then heard the Austrian and Greek representatives and the representative of the Financial Committee.

The Austrian representative, M. Kienböck, referring to the very serious situation which made it necessary for Austria to appeal to the

Council, said that although his Government had taken the most rigorous measures to obtain the necessary foreign exchange for the National Bank it was at present faced with the following alternatives—the suspension of the transfer of the external debt service or the employment of the remainder of the gold and foreign exchange cover for the purpose of continuing to transfer the amounts required for the debt service. In the latter case the Austrian Government would assume a heavy responsibility towards its own country, and would be compelled in the near future to suspend the import of the necessary commodities and raw material.

Austria was now undertaking an extensive programme of financial and economic restoration. She would resolutely continue her efforts and would shortly enter into commercial negotiations.

Replying briefly to the statements made by the representatives of the Great Powers, the Austrian representative affirmed that the Austrian Government was fully aware of the exceptional character of the League 1923 Loan, and it was precisely because it appreciated this that the Austrian Government was at present appealing to the Council. The next two payments on the loan were fully secured by funds already transferred to the respective countries, and neither the bond-holders nor the guarantors ran any risk on that account; even if Austria should be compelled to resort to a temporary transfer moratorium, this would only affect the preparatory operations for the service falling due in future years.

The statements made by the representatives of the Great Powers were of a nature to encourage Austria, but M. Kienböck could not conceal the fact that certain divergences in these statements gave cause for some anxiety. He trusted sincerely that co-operation, on which Austria relied, would be ensured as rapidly as possible, for its efficacy would chiefly depend on the promptitude with which it was given.

The Greek representative, M. Politis, explained the imperative necessity which had compelled his Government to take the measures to which reference had been made. As recommended by the Council on April 15th, the Greek Government would take no final action until it had reached an understanding with its creditors. Urgent and grave circumstances had compelled it, however, pending a final settlement, to take provisional measures to preserve the economic and social situation.

M. Politis then read a statement on behalf of the Greek Government and, more especially, of M. Venizelos, recalling the special circum-

stances in which his country had been placed during and after the war, and recalling also that it had continued fully to meet the external debt service until the world crisis, the shutting out of its products from foreign markets, the impossibility of any credit operations and, finally, the fall of the English pound, had compelled it to do what other countries had done before it.

M. Venizelos had explained why Greece had had to suspend the transfer of the sums due in payment of the coupons maturing on May 1st. Since then Greece had had to abandon the gold standard, the maintenance of which in the past few months had become purely fictitious. The national currency had immediately lost nearly 50 per cent. of its value, and its instability rendered a further decline possible. Had the Greek Government continued to transfer the sums necessary for the loan service this would inevitably have led to complete economic and financial catastrophe, disastrous both to the country itself and to its creditors.

On the contrary, owing to the provisional suspension of transfers and the deposit of the sums required for payment of coupons in a special blocked account, Greece had been able to prevent an irremediable situation and to preserve the hope that if general measures were shortly introduced she might be able to resume the regular debt service.

As regards the loans contracted under the League's auspices, the hope was expressed that no distinction would be made between them and other foreign loans. Such a distinction, possibly quite natural in other countries where the League loans were secured by particular revenues, was impossible in the case of Greece, all of whose loans were secured by the same revenues administered by the International Financial Commission. The earlier loans had priority over the loans concluded under the League's auspices. Greece was absolutely bound by this rule and could not derogate from it.

The Greek Government was prepared to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice the whole existing economic situation. Public opinion would then be in a position to decide whether Greece's attitude was entirely justified. The Greek Government expressed its intention, after completing its inquiry into the economic situation of the country, to submit practical proposals to its creditors. To give further proof of goodwill and good faith it would agree that its capacity to pay should, if necessary, be submitted to arbitration.

The representative of the Financial Com-

mittee, M. Kempner, replying to the statements of the representatives of the four Powers, said that the Financial Committee had been the first to point out that the States with which it was dealing must energetically set to work to put their budgets in order and must use their own resources to restore the situation. The main object of the meetings the Financial Committee had held in Budapest, Vienna, Sofia and Athens had been to consider to what extent the respective Governments could improve their own budget and economic situation. The Committee had, however, pointed out that there were special circumstances that militated in favour of certain States being furnished with means to carry on for a little longer without taking decisions of the greatest importance not only to themselves, but to all the European Governments.

The Financial Committee had felt that, in the case of Austria and Greece, temporary help should be granted pending the solution of the very important problems which those Governments were at present studying.

As regards the observations of the French, Italian and German representatives on the Danubian economic situation, M. Kempner pointed out that the Financial Committee had already called attention to the need of the countries of Central Europe for closer economic relations with the neighbouring and other States.

The League was faced with the following situation. Various countries whose financial reconstruction had been accomplished some years previously with the League's help were on the point of collapsing, and several loans issued under the League's auspices were compromised. Since March the situation had grown worse. For the League to remain inactive would amount to destroying the results of the financial work of the past ten years. It was the duty of the League and of all its competent organs to make every effort and to exert all their energies to safeguard the results already achieved.

M. Kempner pointed out that the Financial Committee would be prepared to re-examine the present situation in consultation with any financial experts that might be appointed.

As regards the Greek Government's failure to meet its foreign debt service, M. Kempner pointed out that the measures described as necessary by M. Venizelos on April 15th went far beyond the Financial Committee's suggestions. The Committee had, on several occasions, expressed the view that certain countries

would be obliged to proceed to a partial suspension of transfer, but it had never thought that those countries would be justified in not paying in national currency the part transferred. In view of the special difficulties with which the Greek Government was faced, the Financial Committee had recommended that it might be good policy for the bond-holders to waive for one year the transfers for amortisation payments on condition that corresponding amounts in drachmæ were paid into a blocked account to be administered carefully and employed for carrying out a programme of public works.

The Greek Government had, however, not negotiated with the bond-holders, but had unilaterally suspended the transfer of the sums required, thus disregarding not only the rights of the holders but also the efforts which, on the League's initiative, the States in general had made to help Greece when she was in difficulties. The Committee was of opinion that such a procedure was not only very injurious to the Greek Government's credit, but also reduced the power of other States to come to its aid by collective action when such assistance was required.

The Council, on the proposal of the rapporteur, the Norwegian representative, requested the Financial Committee to appoint a delegation which should consider forthwith with the Government experts who had already discussed the question, and such others as might be designated by the President of the Council in consultation with the respective Governments and the Council's rapporteur, the financial questions dealt with in the general section of the Financial Committee's report, so that proposals might be submitted to the Council.

In view of the statements of the British, French, German and Italian Governments of their willingness to study certain measures of financial assistance, the Council trusted that agreement on constructive measures might rapidly be reached. It decided to refer the appeal of the Austrian Government to the meeting of Government representatives and the delegation of the Financial Committee, and urged that the Austrian Government should do all in its power to avoid a failure in its obligations. It expressed its confidence that the Austrian Government was fully conscious of the very special measures taken to assist in the financial reconstruction of Austria, and would realise the solemn and binding nature of the obligations which Austria had undertaken towards the League.

In view of its special responsibilities in the case of loans issued under the League's auspices,

the Council impressed on the Greek Government the necessity of making every effort to comply with its obligations, emphasising that a failure to have due regard to their international financial obligations on the part of countries which had benefited from League loans must have the gravest consequences not only on the credit of such countries, but also on the ability of the League to render collective assistance in the future.

The representatives of the British, French, Italian and German Governments accepted the report and the resolution. The Spanish representative, voicing his sympathy with the countries in a difficult situation, expressed the hope that the idea developed by the French representative would be submitted to the Mixed Committee.

* * *

To give effect to the Council resolution the Acting President, after consulting the Belgian, Netherlands, and Swiss Governments, appointed experts from those countries. The Chairman of the Financial Committee appointed a delegation.

This delegation and the Government experts met in Paris on May 30th. There were present :

Delegation of the Financial Committee.

M. Fulvio Suvich (Chairman), former Under-Secretary of State in the Italian Finance Ministry, High Commissioner for Tourism, Chairman of the Financial Committee.

Mr. Norman Davis, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Director of the Bank of New York and Trust Company (American). M. G. Dayras, Inspector of Finances, Director of Technical Services of the Cabinet of the French Finance Minister.

Sir Otto Niemeyer, Bank of England.

Dr. Paul Kempner, Messrs. Mendelssohn and Co.

Dr. Vilém Pospisil, Governor of the Czechoslovak National Bank.

Government Experts.

Germany.—Count Schwerin von Krosick, Director of the Ministry of Finance.

Belgium.—M. Frère, Financial Attaché at the Belgian Legation in Berlin.

France.—M. J. J. Bizot, Assistant Director of the Finance Ministry.

Great Britain.—Sir F. W. Leith-Ross, Comptroller of the Treasury, Chief Economic Adviser to the British Government.

Italy.—Professor Beneduce, Member of the Governing Body of the Bank for International Settlements.

Netherlands.—M. L. J. A. Trip, President of the Nederlandsche Bank.

Switzerland.—M. Musy, Member of the Federal Council, Chief of the *Département des Finances*.

(b) *Bulgarian 1926 and 1928 Loans.*

The trustees of the Bulgarian loans issued under the auspices of the League have communicated to the Council recent correspondence with the Bulgarian Government protesting against that Government's unilateral action in ceasing to pay to the trustees the receipts from the pledged revenues. On the report of the Norwegian representative, the Council requested the Secretary-General to ask the Bulgarian Government for its observations, and to refer the correspondence, together with the observations to the Financial Committee or its delegation.

The Bulgarian representative, alluding to his country's difficult financial situation, informed the Council that, in accordance with the Financial Committee's recommendations, Bulgaria had reduced by 50 per cent. the transfers of the Bulgarian foreign debts and had applied to the holders with a view to arranging for payments.

(c) *The International Labour Conference and the World Crisis.*

A resolution on the economic and financial crisis adopted by the International Labour Conference at its sixteenth session was considered by the Council on May 21st.

The resolution contained four principal suggestions. The first related to the question of big international works for economic equipment and national works on a large scale. The International Labour Conference desired that everything possible should be done to hasten the progress of practical work in this field. The second suggestion referred to the Lausanne Conference; the third to production and trade problems, and the fourth to general problems of currency and credit.

The rapporteur, the Spanish representative, reminded the Council that over twenty-five million workers were at present unemployed. This fact had dominated the proceedings of the Labour Conference and had led it to adopt its resolution. The Council was not called upon to take decisions or to make proposals. That task devolved upon the Governments themselves. The Spanish representative expressed the view that, in forwarding the resolution to the Governments, the Council would no doubt note the Conference's statement that "the economic and financial bodies of the League

had, through the work of their own experts, succeeded in reaching solutions which had been sufficiently worked out and only awaited decisions."

On the proposal of the rapporteur, the Council decided to refer the resolution to the Assembly. It requested the Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment to accelerate its proceedings. It declared that the various League Organisations would be at the disposal of the Lausanne Conference should the latter so desire, and decided to lay before the Assembly the question of the summoning of a world conference to consider problems of production and international trade with a view to the conclusion of international conventions designed to bring about a resumption of economic activity. The Secretariat was requested to make the necessary preliminary examinations.

(d) *The Motor-car Industry.*

A delegation of the Economic Committee (Messrs. Schuller (Austria), Chairman, and Di Nola (Italy)) met at Geneva on May 30th to consult experts of the automobile industry on the world situation as regards the motor-car production and trade and on the international remedies that might be applied to the crisis from which this branch of economic activity is suffering.

The experts taking part in the consultation are M. M. C. Schippert (German), Director of the Daimler-Benz Company; M. P. Plasman (Belgian), Administrator of the Minerva Motors; M. Duchon (French), Member of the Committee of Arts and Manufactures; Mr. Gladstone (British), of the Society of Motor Manufacturers; M. G. Acutis (Italian), President of the National Fascist Industrial Automobile Association; M. T. Herain (Czechoslovakia), Secretary of the Ceskomorawska-Kolben-Danek, and M. de Nercy, Secretary of the Permanent International Office of Motor-car Manufacturers.

The experts described the situation in Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy. In the absence of an American expert, M. de Nercy furnished information on the position in the United States.

An account of the proceedings will be given in the next number of the MONTHLY SUMMARY.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

(a) *Public Works.*

The report of the Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment* was considered by the Council on May 10th.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 128.

The rapporteur recalled that the Committee had examined schemes of public works submitted by Governments from the threefold point of view of action against unemployment, direct or indirect productivity, and international interest. Several schemes had been retained, but it had been impossible to examine others owing to the lack of sufficient data.

The Council decided to postpone its decision until the Committee had been able to submit a larger number of schemes.

On this occasion the Yugoslav representative, M. Fotitch, emphasised the importance, for several countries, in particular Yugoslavia, for whom three schemes had been retained, of the execution of public works on a large scale as a means of action against the present crisis. He expressed the hope that the Committee would meet as soon as possible to examine the schemes which it had not been able to consider before the Council meeting.

(b) *Air Transport Co-operation.*

Two important meetings on air transport co-operation took place in May.

On May 6th and 7th the special Sub-Committee for the study of the constitution and operation of an essential network of permanent air routes held its second session at Geneva. It began by adopting a map relating to the scheme of connections it regarded as essential within the scope of European activity.

As regards ground organisation (landing grounds, buoyage, etc.) the Committee recommended technical uniformity of equipment to be sought within the framework of the International Air Conferences, care being taken to make the decisions adopted readily acceptable to the countries represented at these Conferences.

For the operation of a main network, the Sub-Committee unanimously adopted recommendations regarding greater commercial speed, the permanence of air services, etc. It was also in favour of co-operation between the national companies concerned, as the best method for the operation of the international services, and emphasised that the Companies should make the best use of the possibility of combined transport.

The Bureau of the Air Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments having expressed its desire to be informed of the progress of the Air Transport Co-operation Committee, that body met at Geneva from May 9th to May 12th.

It began by approving the report of the Sub-

Committee, making certain detailed observations regarding the scheme submitted for an international and essential network of permanent air routes. It then studied certain questions which seemed to present a special importance to the Bureau of the Air Commission of the Conference.

The first of these questions, which concerned the freedom of the air, dealt with the conditions subject to which foreign air undertakings could run services in territories other than their national territory.

The Committee considered that the experience of the past twelve years had shown that Governments, now all shareholders in their own national undertakings, exercised their sovereign rights over the atmosphere more directly where they had to do with foreign undertakings as exclusively national as their own, and competing directly with their national undertakings.

The Committee expressed the view that a less rigorous exercise of the rights of sovereignty might be attended by a modification in the strictly national character of aircraft and the practice of subsidising undertakings which in consequence of government action assume a political character.

Secondly, the Committee, to facilitate international co-operation in the national operation of air lines, recommended the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements between countries concerned.

The Committee finally considered the question of the registration of aircraft, in regard to which no special ruling would exist as soon as the final ratifications of the Protocol of June, 1929, would have conferred upon States parties to the 1919 Convention the freedom which States not parties to this Convention already possessed. The Committee unanimously considered it desirable that registration should not depend upon the nationality of the owner, but that it should also be possible to register aircraft owned by foreigners established in the territory.

It recommended that for registration the uniform determining factor should be the effective domicile of the owner. As an aircraft must be registered in a country and in one country only, it is necessary that a uniform regulation should provide for the possibility of registering aircraft belonging to national companies having some foreign capital or directors.

The Committee finally examined several proposals submitted by certain of its members, in regard to which statements were inserted in the report.

V.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

COMMITTEE ON ARTS AND LETTERS.

The second session of the Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters was held at Frankfurt-on-Main on May 12th to May 14th, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the death of Goethe, and at the invitation of the Frankfurt municipal authorities.

The agenda of the Committee, which met under the presidency of M. Jules Destrée, former Belgian Minister of Science and Art, included communications from its members on the subject of Goethe.

Those of M. Paul Valéry, M. Thomas Mann, Mlle Helène Vacaresco and M. de Madariaga dealt with "Goethe, the European"; those of Professor Gilbert Murray, M. Josef Strzygowski, M. Ragnar Oestberg, M. Henri Focillon and M. Georges Oprescu concerned "Goethe and Art"; those of M. Gonzague de Reynold, M. Paribeni and M. Waetzoldt were devoted to Goethe's travels in Switzerland and Italy.

During the exchange of views which followed these communications, the members of the

Committee, which further included Mme. Nini Roll-Anker, M. Béla Bartok, M. Costa du Rels, M. Julien Luchaire and M. Ugo Ojetti, recalled the various aspects of Goethe's genius.

The Committee had, further, to examine certain technical questions referred to the International Institute on Intellectual Co-operation, *viz.*, inquiries regarding the teaching of poetry as a source of culture; the international rôle of the theatre; the conclusions of the Committee of experts which had met at the Institute to study the best means of utilising existing collections of musical records, the results of joint studies with the International Broadcasting Union on the broadcasting of music, the forthcoming publication by the Institute of an international translation bibliography, the creation of an international centre for institutes on the history of art and of archaeology, in order to promote the exchange of methods, instruments of work and staff, and to avoid duplication; the report on the work of the International Museums Office.

VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. DANZIG.

Railway Questions.—On May 10th the Council dealt with several decisions of the League High Commissioner at Danzig, in regard to which either the Polish Government or the Senate of the Free City or both these authorities had appealed. Three of these decisions concerned the personnel of Danzig nationality in the Polish railway service, the supervisory authority within the meaning of the Danzig rail transport laws, and the organisation of the railways situated in the territory of the Free City.

The Council confirmed each of these decisions, which had been taken by the High Commissioner after consulting the Legal Committee of the Transit Organisation.

Use of the Port of Danzig by Poland.—As regards the question of the port of Danzig, the Council, which had before it the opinion of a Committee of Jurists to which it had put certain questions in January, decided that Point 7 of the decision of the High Commissioner, dated August 15th, 1921 (the Polish Government will engage to make full use of the port of Danzig, whatever other ports she may open in the future on the Baltic coast), involves a direct obligation on the Polish Government. This obligation is not restricted to railway questions, but is of general application. It applies to both passenger

and goods traffic, and does not exclude transit traffic through Poland. On the other hand, it does not involve an obligation on the part of the Polish Government to take, as Danzig demands, all necessary measures to ensure that all the Polish maritime traffic shall be trans-shipped in the harbour of Danzig. Nor does it involve a general and unconditional obligation on the Polish Government to take the necessary measures to ensure that the risk of full use not being made of the port shall fall not on Danzig but on the ports opened by Poland on the Baltic coast. The Council decided to suspend judgment on the point of the decision of the High Commissioner, stipulating that, Poland is obliged not to encourage by preferential measures the competition of other ports to Danzig's detriment. The Council referred the matter to the High Commissioner, asking him to invite the parties to complete their statements and to formulate detailed conclusions, with a view to a decision on the question whether in fact the Polish Government does not make full use of the port of Danzig in accordance with the decision of the High Commissioner of August 15th, 1921, and, if not, how and to what extent it utilises the port.

Customs Questions.—For the first time a case of "direct action" in customs matters between

Poland and the Free City was considered by the Council on May 10th and 19th.

A general definition of direct action in relations between Poland and the Free City is given in the report adopted by the Council on March 13th, 1925, the relevant passage reading :

" There is one matter, however, on which the Council could take a decision now. I refer to the question of preventing a dispute between Danzig and Poland from being prejudiced by means of direct action of any kind, and of preventing such action from giving rise to incidents which might involve serious political consequences. The Council certainly realises the importance of this question, and I am sure we will agree that the Governments of the Free City and of the Republic of Poland should never resort to direct action against each other. This necessarily follows from the special relations created by the treaties between Danzig and Poland. The real difficulty is to decide what constitutes direct action in any particular case. Such an action would, I consider, be one which might endanger or prove a serious obstacle to the maintenance of public security in Danzig or which might jeopardise good relations between Danzig and Poland. Such direct action might take the form of passive resistance as well as active measures.

" The Council, which is the final court of appeal in disputes between Danzig and Poland, is also, of course, the competent organ to decide whether either Government has resorted to direct action instead of employing the methods of redress provided for in the treaties. If, however, any serious case of direct action arose, it might be dangerous to wait for a Council meeting. The Council should then, I think, leave it to the High Commissioner at Danzig to decide provisionally whether there has been direct action or not. The Government concerned would, of course, be entitled to appeal to the Council, but the High Commissioner's decision should be accepted until the Council has either confirmed, modified or rejected it."

The case in point originated in a request made by the Polish Government on September 15th, 1931, that the High Commissioner should find that the arbitrary granting of licences concerning the passive finishing trade on the part of the Danzig customs authorities constituted a breach of the treaties. The Polish Finance Minister, however, without awaiting the High Commissioner's decision, instructed the Danzig customs administration on October 30th, 1931, to put a stop to this trade within a specified time limit, and stated that non-observance of these instructions would be regarded as "direct action." The customs administration, on the instructions of the Danzig Senate, which regarded this request as an interference in proceedings pending before the High Commissioner, did not comply with the instructions of the Polish Finance Minister.

On January 9th, 1932, the *Monitor Polski* published a regulation of the Polish Finance Ministry, stating that steps would have to be taken to establish supervision to prevent goods coming from the passive finishing trade at Danzig, regarded by the Finance Ministry as illicit, from entering Poland. The regulations obliged the recipients in Poland of goods falling under one of the fifteen classes enumerated therein to submit proof of the regular customs clearing of each consignment.

On January 29th the Government of the Free City requested the High Commissioner to give a provisional decision to the effect that the Decree of the Polish Finance Ministry constituted direct action.

On February 29th the Polish Government addressed to the High Commissioner a memorandum stating its opinion that the Regulation of the Polish Finance Ministry, dated January 9th, 1932, could not constitute direct action in respect of the Free City, as the regulation in question was merely a measure necessitated by the direct action of the Danzig customs authorities, which had not complied with the Order of the Polish Ministry of Finance, dated October 30th, 1931.

The request meanwhile was examined by a Committee of Experts,* with the consent of the parties, and the High Commissioner, on the basis of this examination, and anxious, in the general interest, to avoid a decision, submitted a draft compromise to the parties.

This compromise was approved on March 24th by the Danzig and Polish experts, subject to the approval of their Governments. The Danzig Senate immediately signified its approval. Having received no communication from the Polish Government on March 29th, the High Commissioner, on the urgent representations of the Senate, gave a provisional decision, based on the opinion of the neutral expert, to the effect that the Decree of the Polish Finance Minister, published in the *Monitor Polski* of June 9th, 1932, constituted direct action within the meaning of the Council resolution of March 13th, 1925.

On April 13th the High Commissioner sent the Council a special report giving a detailed statement of the circumstances in which the decision had been given. In view of the fact, also, that by its report of March 13th, 1925, the Council reserves its competence to decide in matters of direct action, and that its competence is delegated to the High Commissioner

* This Committee included a neutral expert, appointed by the High Commissioner, to whom, by common agreement, the question was first to be submitted.

only provisionally and in urgent cases, the High Commissioner forwarded to the Council a request from the Danzig Senate, dated April 24th, asking him to decide that Poland had taken direct action in two ways, firstly by the non-execution of the provisional decision of March 29th, 1932, and secondly by the issue on April 21st, 1932, of the Financial Penalties Law.

On May 8th the Polish Government lodged an appeal against the High Commissioner's provisional decision, and on May 9th submitted its observations on the Danzig request of April 24th.

The Polish Government emphasised that the fiscal authorities merely applied the Polish laws in force previous to September 15th, 1931, and applicable uniformly to the whole territory of the Polish republic. As regards the Financial Penalties Law, the Polish Government declared that it had not modified the legal provisions of an earlier law dated August 2nd, 1926. It expressed the view that, in so far as the law of March 18th, 1932, was applied in the territory of the Polish Republic, it could not be regarded as being contrary to the High Commissioner's decision of March 29th.

The Polish Government, further, maintained that before an act or passive attitude could be described as direct action it must be shown that the act in question should be prejudicial to a case in dispute, and such as to give rise to incidents entailing serious political consequences. The Polish Government considered that neither of these two conditions were fulfilled in the case under consideration.

On the report of the British representative, the Council affirmed that the provisional decision by the High Commissioner in regard to direct action became immediately executive in spirit. It requested the High Commissioner to give his decisions concerning the requests submitted as soon as possible. It understood that Poland withdrew her appeal against the High Commissioner's decision of March 29th, 1932, and agreed that, pending a final settlement, the Polish fiscal penalties law should not be applied in such a way as to prejudice the solution of the questions concerning the Danzig passive finishing trade and warehousing trade.

The rapporteur, Mr. Eden, emphasised the difficulty of the duties the High Commissioner had to perform. He expressed his conviction that he was interpreting the feelings of the Council as a whole in sincerely congratulating the High Commissioner on the manner in which he had carried out and continued to carry out his difficult task.

2. MANDATES.

Iraq.

On May 19th the Council approved the draft declaration to be made by Iraq on the termination of the mandate régime prepared by a special Committee constituted on January 28th.*

The Mandates Commission had recommended that the termination of the mandate régime in Iraq should be conditional upon guarantees to be furnished by the Iraq Government on the following points:

1. The effective protection of racial, linguistic and religious minorities;
2. Safeguard of the interests of foreigners in the judicial sphere;
3. Freedom of conscience and the safeguard of the activities of religious missions;
4. Rights acquired and financial obligations contracted by the mandatory Power before the termination of the mandate;
5. Respect for international conventions;
6. Concession to the States Members of the League of Nations, under certain conditions, of most-favoured-nation treatment subject to reciprocity.

Lastly, Iraq's declaration must contain a provision giving the Members of the League of Nations represented on the Council the right to lay before the Permanent Court of International Justice any differences of opinion arising out of the interpretation or execution of the undertakings assumed by Iraq before the Council.

In submitting the draft declaration the Committee declared that it had constantly endeavoured to prepare a sufficiently precise and complete declaration, while remaining strictly within the limits indicated, and without imposing on Iraq any obligations likely to hinder her free development as an independent nation.

The Committee further expressed the view that the text of the declaration, which had been discussed with the Prime Minister of Iraq, took full account of the wishes expressed by him and would, in every way, prove acceptable to Iraq.

The draft declaration is divided into two chapters. The first is exclusively devoted to the protection of minorities. The second contains provisions relating to the most-favoured-nation clause, the situation of foreigners in the judicial sphere, international conventions, acquired rights and the financial obligations contracted by the Mandatory Power, freedom of conscience and the activities of religious missions, and

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 15.

procedure for appeal. The Declaration is accompanied by a commentary.

In his report to the Council, the Yugoslav representative, M. Fotitch, stated that, once the draft declaration had been accepted by Iraq in a manner constitutionally effective, it would afford, in accordance with the Council's decision, the guarantees to which the latter decided that the termination of the mandate in Iraq should be subject. The special Committee had expressed itself in favour of the maintenance of a uniform judicial system applicable to all Iraqi nationals and to all foreigners, and had proposed that the system at present in force, which had received the approval of the Council and of the capitulatory Powers, should remain in force for a period of ten years from the admission of Iraq to membership of the League.

The rapporteur explained that the Committee had requested the Council to approve by a recommendation the action which the British Government was called upon to take as mandatory for the purpose of obtaining the consent of Powers whose nationals enjoy capitulation rights in the former Ottoman Empire to renounce those rights for the future. In his opinion, the new Statute contemplated for Iraq rendered superfluous the jurisdictional privileges which, in theory, should be revived in favour of the nationals of the so-called capitulatory Powers as a result of the termination of the mandate, for it took account of the peculiar position of Iraq and, at the same time, respected its status as an independent State.

The rapporteur further recalled that the cessation of the mandate under the Council resolution of January 28th, 1932, was subject to two conditions, *viz.* ;

1. The formal acceptance by Iraq, in conformity with its constitution, of the proposed Declaration ;
2. The admission of Iraq to the League.

The British representative, Mr. Eden, congratulated the Special Committee on its successful accomplishment of a delicate and difficult task.

The French representative, M. Paul-Boncour, recalled that his Government had already stated its point of view with regard to the undertakings to be entered into by Iraq before entering the League. This had been done at the Council meetings of September 1931 and January 1932.* In the draft Declaration the Committee had rightly given the first place to the protection of minorities, but it had, he thought, hesitated to avail itself of all the opportunities offered it in the report of the Mandates Commission.

As in the near Eastern countries where autonomy was based on traditional ideas there were peoples of a very distinct manner of life and character, the French representative wondered whether it would not be possible to institute a minority system in the form of an administrative autonomy. There was a precedent for such a system in the minority treaties themselves. In making this observation M. Paul-Boncour explained that he had in mind both the very clear recommendation of the Mosul Commission and the relations between minority and majority populations, as well as the difficult duty of supervision, which would devolve upon the Council and which such a system would have facilitated.

As regards supervision, the Committee had confined itself to embodying in its text the general guarantee clause laid down in the minority treaties. But it had stated in the report that it had not gone further, as invited by the Mandates Commission because this clause was sufficiently elastic to be adjusted in practice to the special circumstances of Iraq.

M. Paul-Boncour pointed out that the methods which the very general terms of the guarantee clause entitled it to adopt were not necessarily the same in every case. The Council would take a very different view of the matter in the case of a well developed State and in the case of a State which, under the collective responsibility of the Council, was being trained for political freedom. It was, further, legitimate and even essential to indicate clearly that the Council had special responsibilities in the latter case that it must avail itself of every means of fulfilling its obligations and that any decisions it might be called upon to make must not create a precedent affecting the jurisprudence applicable to the protection of minorities in the States he had just mentioned.

As regards the most-favoured-nation clause, M. Paul-Boncour asked for certain explanations, in particular as regards the reservations mentioned in Article 11 of the draft Declaration.

The Italian representative, M. Scialoja, drew special attention to the care taken in the draft Declaration to ensure the protection of minorities and to guarantee the activities of the religious communities and missions. He also drew attention to the satisfactory solution in regard to the economic equality of States Members of the League in their commercial relations with the new State.

The Polish representative, M. Zaleski, associated himself with the observations of the French representative as regards minorities. Personally, he would have been glad if the

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, p. 243, and Vol. XII., No. 1 p. 16.

Committee could have at once taken into account the experience already acquired in this field and had established a system to prevent the minority clause from being used for purposes not in accordance with their real object.

The German representative, Count Welczeck, emphasised that the regulations provided for the protection of minorities were of the greatest importance from the point of view of the League. By these regulations the League had again recognised the principle of the protection of minorities as embodied in the relevant treaties and declarations. For this reason the German representative felt particular satisfaction that the Powers represented on the Council had been given an opportunity of renewing their confession of faith in regard to the protection of minorities.

The Norwegian representative, M. Andvord, associated himself with the French representative's statement regarding minorities. This, his Government considered, was one of the most important functions of the Council, and he regretted that the opportunity had not been taken to make special arrangements with a view to improving the Council's procedure.

The rapporteur, M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia), recalled that the Special Committee had had to ensure the effective protection of racial, linguistic, and religious minorities. It had, however, been bound by a Council resolution approving the report of the Mandate Commission rejecting a petition from the Kurds asking for the establishment of autonomy. The Committee had confined itself to drawing up a guarantee clause based upon the declaration that was already in force, and if it had not thought it necessary to introduce exceptional new provisions for Iraq it was because, as stated by M. Paul-Boncour, the guarantee clause was sufficiently elastic.

As regards the most-favoured-nation clause, the rapporteur explained that the Committee

had had two aims in view: first, that all Members of the League should enjoy equality of treatment in their economic relations with Iraq; and, secondly, that Iraq should be safeguarded against an unduly hard and fast formula which might have aggravated a difficult situation from the point of view of economic development.

The Committee had therefore inserted a reservation which enabled Iraq to release herself from the obligation to grant most-favoured-nation treatment to Members of the League which might by certain measures disturb economic equilibrium to the detriment of Iraq and seriously affect her principal exports. Iraq, however, would be unable to exercise this power in an arbitrary way, as Members of the Council could bring a dispute on the question before the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Most of the Members of the Council expressed their goodwill and good wishes towards the new State which, they hoped, would soon become a Member of the League.

The Council adopted the following resolution:

The Council,

Approves the draft declaration and report submitted to it by its Committee in accordance with paragraph 4 of its resolutions of January 28th, 1932;

Approves the report submitted this day by the representative of Yugoslavia, its rapporteur;

Accordingly recommends that the Powers concerned, whose nationals enjoyed capitulation rights in the former Ottoman Empire, renounce, before the admission of Iraq to the League of Nations, the maintenance of these former jurisdictional privileges in favour of their nationals in future;

Requests the Secretary-General to communicate this recommendation to the Governments of the States which the British Government, in accordance with the present resolution, will approach with a view to the proposed renunciation.

VII.—PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

1. IN UPPER SILESIA.

(a) *Petition from the Prince of Pless.*

It will be remembered that at its sixty-sixth session the Council finished its examination of the question regarding petitions from the Prince of Pless pending since January, 1931.* Following further petitions from the Prince of Pless, the German representative informed the Secretary-General on May 17th that his Government would submit the question to the Permanent Court of International Justice for a

decision under Article 72, paragraph 3, of the Convention on Upper Silesia of May 15th, 1922. The Council accordingly, on May 18th, noted this communication and closed its consideration of the matter.

(b) *Petitions received from Madame Franziska Senhalla and M. Johann Mokros concerning their personal situation.*

On the report of the Japanese representative, the Council closed its examination of questions dealt with in petitions from Madame Franziska

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 20.

Senkalla and M. Johann Mokros concerning their personal situation.

(c) *Petitions from the Union of Poles in Germany.*

The Council adjourned to its next session its consideration of petitions from the Union of Poles in Germany dated November 10th, 1931, and April 23rd, 1932.

2. IN POLAND.

Application of the Agrarian Reform.

On January 19th, 1932, the German Government asked the Council to include in its agenda a question concerning the application of the agrarian reform in Poland, as raised in three petitions from M. Graebe. On January 30th the Council decided to examine this question at its May session.

On May 21st the rapporteur, M. Nagaoka (Japan), submitted a report to the Council expressing the view that the question put to the Council was essentially the same as that examined in 1930 and 1931 by a Minorities Committee composed of the Persian, Italian and British representatives, the results of which had been communicated to the Council in accordance with the procedure adopted in the Madrid resolution of May 13th, 1929. The rapporteur considered that the question was, first, whether there was any occasion to modify the conclusion, reached by the Minorities Committee* which a year ago examined the explanations of the Polish Government, and, secondly, whether the application of the agrarian reform since that date had been in conformity with these conclusions.

The rapporteur accordingly proposed that the Council should request the Italian and British representatives to assist him in preparing a report for submission to the Council next September. This Committee would be entitled to consult experts, and it was understood that the Polish Government would supply it with all the information it might consider necessary for the preparation of this report.

The German representative drew the Council's attention to the fact that the minority had sent the Council several petitions showing that the application of the agrarian reform operated in a manner highly prejudicial to persons belonging to the German minority. No action had been taken on the first of the petitions. A supplementary petition submitted in 1929 had been examined by a Committee. The German representative then read a passage from a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by this Committee, setting forth its conclusions.

These conclusions had given great satisfaction to the German Government, which had felt that there was reason to hope that its findings would put an end to the disadvantages which had arisen to the detriment of the minority. In the German Government's opinion, these conclusions should in practice have exempted the estates belonging to the minority from the agrarian reform until the disproportion had disappeared. Matters had, however, so developed as to justify the apprehension that the practice of the Polish authorities was not in harmony with the spirit of the Minorities Committee's decision. Three months after the dispatch of the letter, the Land Office at Graudenz had, in application of the agrarian reform law, parcelled out over one thousand hectares of land belonging to the German minority, and new parcellings out of German estates were meantime in preparation. The Polish Government had explained this operation by the argument that in selecting the land to be parcelled out one must begin with the larger estates, and that almost all the large estates in the region belonged to members of the minority. The agrarian law did actually contain a provision stipulating its order of expropriation, but this provision had been abrogated on February 13th, 1928. The minority feared that after the large German estates had been parcelled out there would be nothing to prevent the authorities from subjecting the medium and small estates of the minority to the agrarian reform law, while sparing the large Polish estates.

The German representative then quoted figures of the expropriation of land for 1932. He accepted the report, but expressed the hope that the Council would agree with him that the situation of the German minority ought not to be aggravated before the final settlement. He also hoped that the Committee to be set up would bear these facts in mind and would not lose sight of the risks involved if faced with a *fait accompli*.

M. Zaleski agreed to the report, but made a few remarks concerning the procedure. The first of the three petitions from M. Graebe, together with the Polish Government's observations, had, in accordance with the usual procedure, been submitted to a Minority Committee. The fact that two later petitions had not been dealt with in the same way, and that the first petition had been taken out of the hands of the Minorities Committee because the German Government had, by its note dated January, 1932, asked for the inclusion of the matter in the Council agenda. The Polish representative did not challenge the right of

* The conclusions are contained in the Committee's letter of May 23rd, 1931.

any Member of the Council to take action under Article 12 of the Minorities Treaty, but he expressed the view that the regular procedure of examination by committees had been established so as to make it possible for minority questions to be examined wholly apart from political considerations.

The case before the Council showed that in one and the same question it was possible to apply two parallel and simultaneous procedures. This possibility the Polish representative considered at variance with the spirit of the Council resolutions, and deserving of the Council's most serious attention.

The second point raised by M. Zaleski concerned the fact that the German representative had quoted a text, the publication of which was contingent, under the Madrid resolution of the Council, on the Polish Government's consent. By so doing he considered that the German representative had deliberately infringed the procedure in force, and he expressly reserved his Government's right to deduce the conclusions it might think necessary.

As regards the merits of the question, M. Zaleski preferred not to enter into the discussion initiated by the German representative. He voiced his entire confidence in the impartial consideration of the matter by the Committee to be set up.

The Yugoslav representative, M. Fotitch, also agreed with the report. He associated himself with the observations made by the Polish representative regarding the existence of two parallel and simultaneous procedures.

The French representative, M. Paul-Boncour, also felt obliged to make a few remarks on the change of procedure.

The protection of minorities was one of the fundamental tasks of the League and, in particular, of the Council. To carry out that task the Council itself had instituted procedures which require delicate and very circumspect handling. At Madrid the Council had codified the rules of procedure, which it substituted for the individual action prescribed in Article 12 of the Minorities Treaty with Poland, what might be called the procedure of Committees of Three. In the present case a Committee of Three had already been set up under the procedure, but it had been suspended in consequence of action taken with a view to bringing the matter before the Council. The repeated interruption of the procedure of committees of three would result in the combination of two procedures, and the Council would have to inquire whether it should not choose between them. The French representative concluded

that the point might eventually have to be discussed either in the Council or in the Sixth Assembly Committee.

The German representative had complied strictly and in all respects with the conditions of the existing procedure. It was generally admitted that any Member of the Council had the right and duty to bring to the Council's notice any violation or threatened violation of a minority right, even when the minority in question had already brought a complaint before a Committee of Three. The fact that a matter was pending before a Committee of Three did not effect the right of each State Member of the Council to raise the matter before the Council itself. The German Government's decision to bring the question of agrarian reform direct before the Council was due to the fact that the decision of the first Committee of Three did not appear to be such as to improve the situation, which actually had become worse owing to the agrarian reform.

M. Welczeck protested against the Polish representative's observation that to quote a letter from a Committee of Three to the Secretary-General constituted an infringement of the procedure in force. It was true that under the Madrid resolution the publication of a letter from a Committee of Three was subject to the consent of the Government concerned, but this applied only to procedure open before a Committee of Three. The situation was changed when a matter was withdrawn from a Committee of Three and submitted to the Council. In such a case the Council must dispose of the necessary information, and this information might include the letter by which the Committee of Three closed the procedure relating to the petition. As the Council's decisions were public, it was inevitable that any documentation placed before it should likewise become public.

He agreed that the question whether two procedures should be employed at the same time should be examined by the Sixth Assembly Committee.

The Polish representative maintained his reservations, including more especially that relating to publicity. He reserved his Government's right to raise the question of procedure at a subsequent meeting.

M. Andvord (Norway) confirmed the importance of the question of procedure, reserving his Government's opinion if, in accordance with the suggestion of the French representative, the question were referred to the Sixth Assembly Committee.

The Council adopted the report.

3. IN ROUMANIA.

The Council also dealt with the question of petitions from the descendants of the members of the former Szekler (Hungarian) Frontier Guard Regiment.*

The Committee of Jurists set up by the Council in January had submitted its report on a preliminary question raised by the Roumanian Government, namely, whether before petitioning the League a minority must exhaust all the legal channels in its own country. The rapporteur informed the Council that from conversations he had had with the Roumanian representative he had reached the conclusion that it would be in the interests of all concerned if a practical solution could be found. If the Roumanian Government agreed to enter into negotiations with the rapporteur, the Council need not necessarily express an opinion on the report of the Committee.

The Council, accordingly, requested the Roumanian Government to enter into negotiations, and asked the rapporteur to report at its next session in September. It requested the Norwegian and British representatives to assist the rapporteur in the negotiations, and asked the Roumanian Government to give him any facilities necessary for acquiring a thorough knowledge of the elements of the question.

The Roumanian representative accepted the report and the resolution. His Government,

he said, was prepared to enter into negotiations, which he hoped would soon lead to a satisfactory result. The British and Norwegian representatives agreed to assist the rapporteur.

The German representative, Count Welczeck, drawing the Council's attention to the negative reply of the jurists to the preliminary question put, regretted, in the interests of the prestige and authority of the Council, that the latter was unable to accept this opinion unanimously. Although no Member of the League was under any legal obligation to accept the opinion of a committee of jurists, he would have hoped that the Roumanian Government would have been willing to accept that opinion, for reasons of general League policy.

He thought, however, that he could agree to the report, if the proposal were interpreted as expressing the hope that, apart from any legal questions, it would be possible to reach a solution acceptable to the parties.

The Roumanian representative pointed out that the Council's principal task in matters of this kind was fundamentally to find a practical solution by means of conciliation. For that reason he concurred in the interpretation given by the German representative and assured him that the practical question was unanimously regarded as paramount. The Roumanian Government would make every endeavour to promote a solution of that kind.

VIII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

It will be remembered that on April 30th the Special Assembly was informed by the Chinese and Japanese representatives that an agreement was about to be concluded at Shanghai.† On May 5th, at 1.20 p.m. (local time), the Sino-Japanese military agreement on the final cessation of hostilities was concluded at Shanghai.‡ The withdrawal of the Japanese troops began on May 6th, and, on the 11th, the Japanese War Minister announced that all Japanese forces still at Shanghai would be shortly withdrawn. The Chinese police took over the evacuated territories.

As regards Manchuria, communications from the Chinese delegation stated that Japanese troops had been in contact with Chinese troops in the neighbourhood of the Chinese Eastern Railway, about one hundred miles to the south-east of Harbin.

The Lytton Commission which, at the beginning of May, was at Mukden, left for Changchun, Kirin, and Harbin. From Harbin the experts proceeded to Tsitsikar, the Commission itself returning to Mukden, where it was joined by the experts. The Commission then visited Dairen, returned to Mukden, and left Manchuria for Peking.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE
DEFINITIVE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES
AT SHANGHAI, CONCLUDED ON
MAY 5th, 1932.

ARTICLE I.

The Japanese and Chinese authorities having already ordered to cease fire, it is agreed that the cessation of hostilities is rendered definite as from May 5th, 1932. The forces of the two sides will so far as lies in their control cease around Shanghai all and every form of hostile act. In the event of doubts arising in regard to the cessation of hostilities, the situation in this respect will be ascertained by the representatives of the participating friendly Powers.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 21.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 134.

‡ The text follows:

ARTICLE II.

The Chinese troops will remain in their present positions pending later arrangements upon the re-establishment of normal conditions in the areas dealt with by this Agreement. The aforesaid positions are indicated in Annex I to this Agreement.

ARTICLE III.

The Japanese troops will withdraw to the International Settlement and the extra-Settlement roads in the Hongkew district as before the incident of January 28th, 1932. It is, however, understood that in view of the numbers of Japanese troops to be accommodated, some will have to be temporarily stationed in localities adjacent to the above mentioned areas. The aforesaid localities are indicated in Annex II to this Agreement.

ARTICLE IV.

A Joint Commission, including members representing the participating friendly Powers, will be established to certify the mutual withdrawal. This Commission will also collaborate in arranging for the transfer from the evacuating Japanese forces to the incoming Chinese police, who will take over as soon as the Japanese forces withdraw. The constitution and procedure of this Commission will be as defined in Annex III to this Agreement.

ARTICLE V.

The present Agreement shall come into force on the day of signature thereof.

The present Agreement is made in the Japanese and Chinese and English languages. In the event of there being any doubts as to the meaning or any differences of meaning between the Japanese and Chinese and English texts, the English text shall be authoritative.

Done at Shanghai, this fifth day of May, nineteen hundred and thirty two,

(Japanese and Chinese signatures.)

In the presence of:—

(Signatures of foreign Heads of Mission.)

Representatives of the friendly Powers assisting in the negotiations in accordance with the Resolution of the Assembly of the League of Nations of March 4, 1932.

ANNEX I.

The following are the positions of the Chinese troops as provided in Article II of this Agreement.

Reference the attached Postal Map of the Shanghai District scale 1/150,000.

From a point on the Soochow creek due south of Anting village north along the west bank of a creek immediately east of Anting village to Wang-hsien-ch'iao, thence north across a creek to a point four kilometres east of Shatow, and thence north-west up to and including Hu-pei-kou on the Yangtze River.

In the event of doubts arising in regard thereto, the positions in question will, upon the request of the Joint Commission, be ascertained by the representatives of the participating friendly Powers, members of the Joint Commission.

ANNEX II.

The following are the localities as provided in Article III of this Agreement.

The aforesaid localities are outlined on the attached maps marked "A," "B," "C," and "D." They are referred to as areas 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Area 1 is shown on Map "A." It is agreed (1) that this area excludes Woosung Village; (2) that the Japanese will not interfere with the operation of the Shanghai-Woosung Railway or its workshops.

Area 2 is shown on Map "B." It is agreed that the Chinese cemetery about one mile more or less to the north east of the International race track is excluded from the area to be used by the Japanese troops.

Area 3 is shown on Map "C." It is agreed that this area excludes the Chinese village T'sao Chia Chai and the Sanyu Cloth Factory.

Area 4 is shown on Map "D." It is agreed that the area to be used includes the Japanese cemetery and eastward approaches thereto.

In the event of doubts arising in regard thereto, the localities in question will, upon the request of the Joint Commission be ascertained by the representatives of the participating friendly Powers, members of the Joint Commission.

The withdrawal of the Japanese troops to the localities indicated above will be commenced within one week of the coming into force of the Agreement and will be completed in four weeks from the commencement of the withdrawal.

The Joint Commission to be established under Article IV will make any necessary arrangements for the care and subsequent evacuation of any invalids or injured animals that cannot be withdrawn at the time of the evacuation. These may be detained at their positions together with the necessary medical personnel. The Chinese authorities will give protection to the above.

ANNEX III.

The Joint Commission will be composed of 12 members, namely one civilian and one military representative of each of the following: the Japanese and Chinese Governments, and the American, British, French and Italian Heads of Mission in China, being the representatives of the friendly Powers assisting in the negotiations in accordance with the Resolution of the Assembly of the League of Nations of March 4th. The members of the Joint Commission will employ such numbers of assistants as they may from time to time find necessary in accordance with the decisions of the Commission. All matters of procedure will be left to the discretion of the Commission, whose decisions will be taken by majority vote, the Chairman having a casting vote. The Chairman will be elected by the Commission from amongst the members representing the participating friendly Powers.

The Commission will in accordance with its decisions watch in such manner as it deems best the carrying out of Articles 1, 2 and 3 of this Agreement and is authorised to call attention to any neglect in the carrying out of the provisions of any of the three Articles mentioned above.

2. THE LIBERIAN REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE.

On May 20th, 1932, the Council adopted the report of the Committee appointed by its resolution of January 24th, 1931, to inquire

in what practical manner it would be possible to assist the Liberian Government, at its request, to give effect in principle to the recommendations and suggestions of the International Commission of Inquiry.*

The plan, which was based upon the recommendations of the League experts as modified by certain observations of the Liberian Government, contains the broad outlines of a scheme of administrative, financial, social, and health assistance which is intended to serve as a basis for negotiations between the Liberian Government on the one hand and the American Finance Corporation and the Firestone Plantations Company on the other. This plan was held by the Committee to represent the irreducible minimum necessary to effect the desired reforms in Liberia.

Viscount Cecil, Chairman of the Committee, explained that there was no intention of imposing any plan on the Liberian Government. Whatever was done must be done with its consent and co-operation. The Committee had undertaken its task with the idea of safeguarding above all the free development of Liberia under conditions of sound economy and impartiality.

The original plan of the League experts envisaged a number of far-reaching reforms in matters of general administration, public health, finance and justice. It proposed that the Liberian Government should obtain the services of qualified foreign specialists to be chosen by the League and to be given adequate power by Liberia. It also made provision for an extensive programme of public health reforms, prospecting and road development.

The experts found, however, that the present financial resources of Liberia were inadequate to cover the cost of the whole projected programme of assistance, and that it was impossible to find the necessary funds on the market for financing such a plan.

The task of outlining a plan of assistance for Liberia was limited by the existence of two contracts: the loan contract made by Liberia with the American Finance Corporation, and the concessions contract with the Firestone Plantations Company. These contracts were

found to be essential factors in the situation. Within these limits it was attempted to find the best solution for all parties.

The experts accordingly suggested the opening of negotiations with the two American groups aforementioned, in order to find the means of realising the reforms proposed. They considered that this solution would be profitable to all the parties concerned: indeed, they declared that if the general conditions of Liberia did not improve, the fate of the first block of the loan granted by the American Finance Corporation might well be compromised, and even the future of the important Firestone Plantations Company might be jeopardised.

The American Finance Corporation on being approached indicated that, while not prepared to commit itself for the present, it was disposed nevertheless to give favourable consideration to such proposals as might be made, provided the experts' plan formed the basis of a definite programme affording sufficient guarantees from the administrative, financial and judicial point of view. The Firestone Plantations Company also indicated that it was prepared to make the utmost possible allowance for the general interests of Liberia, and that it would be ready, in consideration of the well-being of the population, to take account of competent opinions.

At its May meeting the Committee of the Council thoroughly examined the recommendations of the experts, and also had the benefit of a memorandum submitted by the Liberian delegation proposing certain modifications in the experts' plan, especially those which touched upon the constitutional structure of Liberia. The Committee came to the conclusion that, mainly for financial reasons, the programme of assistance as proposed by the experts should be curtailed, and a more limited programme adopted which would not result in increasing the financial encumbrance on Liberia or go beyond her existing loan agreements.

On this more limited basis the experts prepared a modified plan which was agreed to by the Committee as the basis for negotiations between Liberia and the two American corporations concerned. The plan recommended by the Committee to the Council was based on the following general principles:

Administration:—It was proposed that three foreign specialists with three assistants should assist the Government of Liberia as Commissioners for the administration of the provinces. These provincial commissioners would be the representatives of the executive power acting through the intermediary of the Secretary of the Interior. They would see that the laws and

* The Committee, which was composed of representatives of Great Britain, France, the United States of America, Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland, and Venezuela (later Panama) held three meetings: in London, February 27th to March 3rd, 1931, at which terms of reference were adopted to guide the three experts MM. Brunot, Lighthart, and Mackenzie, who were sent to Liberia to study and report upon a plan of assistance; in Geneva, January 25th to February 4th, and from May 9th to 19th, 1932, when the plan of the experts was examined and the report drafted for the Council. See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 3, p. 93, and Vol. XII., No. 2, p. 52.

regulations are carried out and be responsible for public peace and order. They would control and direct, under instructions from the Central Government, the exercise of authority by the native chiefs over their tribes. They would also train the future administrative personnel of the provinces.

The provincial commissioners would ensure the collection of taxes and the drafting of provincial budgets. They would be charged with the administration of provincial police, and have certain magisterial duties and disciplinary powers. It would be their duty, further, to ensure the strict application of the laws abolishing slavery, pawning and forced labour. Further, the provincial commissioners would assist in constructing a system of communications and the opening up of schools.

Health.—It was recommended that two foreign specialists be appointed to carry out the International Quarantine Regulations and supervise the hospital and public health services.

Finance.—It was proposed that the present financial adviser and his assistants, for whom the loan agreement with the American Finance Corporation provides, would be retained with certain new arrangements.

It was also proposed to seek an understanding with the financial groups in Liberia, making it possible to obtain (1) a moratorium on the interest and sinking fund payments of the first two and a half million dollar loan, (2) the payment of the balance of \$247,000 of the first block of this loan to serve as an initial fund for financing the programme of assistance, and (3) the readjustment of existing contracts, especially in connection with the scope of the concession granted to the Firestone Plantations Co., which is to be reduced to figures more commensurate with the possibilities of the country, and the rent thereon raised from 6 cents to 50 cents per acre.

Co-ordination of measures of reform and liaison with the League of Nations.—The plan provides for a Chief Adviser to be appointed by the League, responsible to and removable by the League and attached to the Central Government, in order to give it the benefit of his advice, to co-ordinate the work of the foreign experts, and to supervise the execution of the scheme of assistance. His appointment would be made with the acceptance of the President of Liberia, and he would be granted all facilities for the performance of his duties and make such investigations as he might think necessary. The Chief Adviser, in case of negligence in the application of the scheme, would be empowered to inform the Government and advise on the steps to be taken, and should his recommenda-

tions have no effect he could submit the question to the Council of the League. Should the Council's recommendations not be carried out by the Liberian Government, the proposed agreement would lapse, and the modifications made in the loan contract with the American Finance Corporation in favour of Liberia would no longer be binding on that Company.

The Committee felt that if the League of Nations were to reply favourably to Liberia's request for assistance, it could only lend its support to work which promised to be efficient. It considered that the general lines it had indicated were a minimum below which it would appear impossible to go if satisfactory results were to be achieved and legitimate guarantees given to all parties concerned.

To the foregoing proposals the Liberian delegation made certain reservations, particularly in connection with the number and salaries of the foreign specialists who would act as provincial commissioners, the appointment of a Chief Adviser, the number of foreign health specialists, and the placing of police forces at the disposal of provincial commissioners. The Liberian delegation, however, undertook to submit the Council's recommendations to the Liberian Government.

The Italian and Spanish representatives on the Committee agreed with the proposals, provided they were clearly understood to be subject to the acceptance of the Liberian Government, with whom it lay to form an opinion as to their constitutional aspects.

The United States representative on the Committee stated that his Government believed that the delegation of adequate authority to a single official of an international agency would be the most genuinely practical solution of the problem. This would leave the details of a programme of complete rehabilitation to be put into effect step by step and on a self-supporting basis, and would take advantage of all existing machinery with a minimum of lost time and a maximum of results at the smallest initial cost to Liberia. The American Government was, however, prepared to study a proposal involving more initial changes in Liberian organisation and consequently much greater initial expense, provided it were clearly understood that there would be the requisite delegation of authority by Liberia as an indispensable preliminary to any adjustment of the present financial situation.

He informed the Committee that :

"The United States seeks no special advantage or position in Liberia, and desires only the welfare and development of the Liberian people and the proper protection of American nationals and their

investments. In the opinion of the American Government, conditions in Liberia have now grown so chaotic, and adequate authority has become so demoralized, that it is doubtful whether an effective government exists in the country. Assistance must be promptly forthcoming if social disintegration is to be arrested. The best evidence that the Liberian authorities could give that they are still cognizant of their responsibility toward their country would be the prompt enactment by them of satisfactory provisions for administrative reform. Furthermore, it may be pointed out that the proposed plan of Liberian rehabilitation to be achieved through a period of assistance would be finally to provide for the benefit of the Liberian people precisely that sovereignty and independence which has been discussed in connection with the delegation of requisite authority.

"This is rightly a matter of international concern which should be solved through sustained international co-operation. The American Government would be deeply disappointed if there were a suspension of the present negotiations looking toward the regeneration of Liberia, and it accordingly suggests that a sub-committee with adequate authority be appointed at the earliest possible moment, which should be instructed to remain in session until it had elaborated the basis of a workable plan. The United States would be pleased immediately to delegate a representative to participate in the work of this sub-committee.

"In the event, however, that the Liberian problem is left from now until next autumn without solution and without a continuing means of international co-operation to deal with it, the American Government would find it necessary to reserve its position and its full liberty of action."

Accordingly the American Government was not willing to recommend to the American Finance Corporation as an interested party any financial negotiations until a satisfactory administrative plan had been agreed to by Liberia. This view, it was stated, was based upon many years of experience in endeavouring to induce the governing elements in Liberia to improve the condition of the country through "advisers" and upon the conviction that no plan can succeed until it is founded upon principles which will ensure its practicability.

The Council requested the Liberian Government to state as early as possible whether it would accept the general principles of the plan of assistance as recommended by the Committee. If these principles were accepted it was considered desirable that the negotiations proposed between the interested parties—who should be vested with the requisite full powers—should take place in August in order that the details of the plan could be drawn up in time for submission to the Council at its meeting in September. The President was accordingly asked to convene a meeting of the Council Committee to consider the situation when the

reply from the Liberian Government was known, and at all events not later than August.

The Council authorised the Financial Organisation of the League to lend its assistance in the proposed negotiations between Liberia and the American Finance Corporation, and to refer all matters affecting public health to the Health Committee.

* * *

The attention of both the Committee and the Council had been drawn to the situation in the Kroo region of Liberia by the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States of America. According to the information brought to the Committee in identical form from a number of sources, a large number of Kroos had taken refuge in the forest after the hostilities which took place between them and the Frontier Force under situations described in the reports of Mr. Rydings and Mr. Travell. These Kroos were said to be refusing to make any response owing to lack of confidence in the offers of the Liberian authorities to negotiate and their situation in the bush at the beginning of the rainy season is very serious, since they are without shelter or means of subsistence.

The Committee, in complete agreement with the Liberian delegation, recommended that the Council despatch to the Kroo region, after consultation with the Liberian Government, a representative to secure the pacification of the Kroo tribes and to persuade them to return to their homes.

This recommendation, together with the proposal to submit to the Liberian Government the general plan of assistance recommended by the Committee, was adopted by the Council.

3. CLAIM OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT AGAINST THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT WITH REGARD TO FINNISH VESSELS USED BY THE LATTER DURING THE WAR.

The claim of the Finnish Government with regard to Finnish vessels used by the latter during the war was considered by the Council on May 18th. It was able to note that the parties had reached an agreement on the method by which the first two questions arising out of the claim should be settled.*

In the opinion of the Committee which examined the claim and reported to the Council on January 30th, the first two questions were:

- "(a) Have the Finnish ship-owners, or have they not, exhausted the means of recourse placed at their disposal by British law?
- "(b) Did the fact that those ship-owners had

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII, No. 1, p. 27.

not exhausted the means of recourse in question constitute an obstacle such as to prevent the Finnish Government from claiming compensation from the British Government ? "

On that occasion the British representative suggested that the question should be adjourned to enable him to communicate the report to his Government. The Committee having also suggested that it would be well if the parties could agree on the solution of these two questions according to the information which the rapporteur, the Spanish representative, had received from the parties, the two Governments recently opened direct negotiations concerning these conclusions.

The Council congratulated the two parties on having reached an agreement, and requested them to keep it informed of subsequent developments.

4. GRECO-BULGARIAN EMIGRATION.

On May 10th the Council noted the advisory opinion of Permanent Court of International Justice on the following question :

" In the case at issue is there a dispute between Greece and Bulgaria within the meaning of Article 8 of the Moloff-Caphandaris Agreement ? If so, what is the nature of the pecuniary obligations arising out of this Agreement ? "

The decision to seek the Court's advisory opinion on this subject was taken by the Council on September 19th, 1931.* The difference between the Bulgarian and Greek Governments concerned the application of the Hoover

proposal to Bulgarian reparations in connection with the execution of the Moloff-Caphandaris Agreement.

The Greek Government considered that it was entitled to connect its debt to Bulgarian refugees with the Bulgarian Government's debt on reparation account, and to set off the one against the other.

Meanwhile, by letters dated November 14th and November 23rd, 1931, the Greek and Bulgarian Governments notified the League of an arrangement concluded between them at Athens on November 11th, 1931, to the effect that the legal situation of the parties should remain as it stood when the Council, on September 19th, applied to the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion.

On March 8th the Permanent Court of International Justice expressed the opinion that, in the case at issue, there was no dispute between Greece and Bulgaria within the meaning of Article 8 of the Moloff-Caphandaris Agreement, and that the second question, therefore, did not arise.

The Council congratulated the Greek and Bulgarian Governments on the conclusion of the Athens arrangement and expressed the hope that the negotiations entered into with a view to a general settlement of the existing difficulties might lead to a satisfactory result at an early date.

IX.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

1. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

Fifteenth Session of the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs held its fifteenth session from April 15th to May 4th at Geneva, under the presidency of M. Bourgois (France). Its report to the Council may be summarised as follows :

Ratification of the 1925 and 1931 Conventions.—Cuba, the Irish Free State, Iraq and Bolivia having ratified the Convention, the number of ratifications is now forty-seven.

The United States deposited on April 28th the instruments of ratification of the 1931 Convention for the Limitation of Manufacture and the Regulation of Distribution of Narcotics, and Nicaragua acceded on March 16th.

The Committee drew the attention of Governments to the importance of prompt ratification with a view to bringing the Convention into force. It asked the Council to bring this matter to the notice of all States.

Annual Reports on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs.—The Committee examined the annual reports of Governments for 1929 and 1930. On this occasion, interesting information was given on the situation with regard to the manufacture, import and export of drugs and the progress made in legislation.

In 1930 there was a considerable reduction in the total quantities of drugs produced by the principal manufacturing countries. This fortunate development is due to the strict enforcement of the Geneva Convention, as well as the strengthening of administrative control in the various States.

The Committee noted with satisfaction the new legislative measures taken by France and Switzerland with the result that the administrative control over the drug manufacture and traffic has been rendered more effective. On January 1st, Yugoslavia introduced a law whose provisions are in conformity with the international conventions. In Poland, a Decree dated December 15th, 1931, extended the system of import and export certificates to codeine.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 9, p. 258.

The Committee considered several statistical tables prepared by the Secretariat and annexed to the summary of annual reports. In view of their importance it decided to publish them.

Preparation of a Model Code.—The Committee discussed the question of drawing up a Model Code to assist Governments in preparing the necessary legislative and administrative measures for the application in their territories of the 1931 Convention.

Illicit Traffic.—The Committee discussed the various aspects of the illicit traffic in opium and other drugs. It noted with regret that all States had not yet given all the desirable assistance as regards the suppression of the traffic. It accordingly asked the Council to impress upon States the importance of close co-operation between the competent authorities and with the League.

The following recommendations were adopted:

1. Governments should be asked to include in their annual reports a full statement as to the regulations applicable to the exercise of the profession of pharmacist, the conditions under which the sale of dangerous drugs by pharmacists is permitted and the supervision exercised over purchases and sales.

2. The Secretary-General should draw the attention of Governments to the importance of indicating adequate penalties for serious offences under the laws on narcotics. The Secretariat will prepare a statement showing the maximum penalties that can be imposed for offences in connection with the international illicit traffic.

3. The Secretary-General should ask Governments to consider the possibility of considering as an offence the fact of procuring dangerous drugs or taking part as an intermediary for their supply in any given country unless authorised to do so by the Government.

4. The Committee should again urge the necessity of closest co-operation between the Governments in the investigation of the transactions and movements of illicit traffickers.

* * *

The Committee considered the situation in Egypt, India, Turkey and Persia.

Situation in Egypt.—The Committee noted with satisfaction the statements made by Russell Pacha, which bore witness to a decrease in the number of opium and drug addicts in Egypt.

Russell Pacha stated that a decline in the clandestine importation of heroin had resulted in an increase of illicit importation of hashish and opium. The Egyptian Government encountered certain difficulties in the campaign

it had undertaken. Egyptian law provides for traffickers a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment and a thousand pounds fine, but this law is not applicable to the foreign traffickers in Egypt. In Russell Pacha's opinion, Egypt would never be able to rid herself entirely of drug addiction until the problem of the foreign trafficker were solved.

The Greek representative, invited to take part in the debate, said that although the Greek law had been found effective to protect Greece against the drug danger, his Government, in order to facilitate the task of the Egyptian Government, had introduced a new Narcotics Bill, which had been submitted to the Chamber. This Bill would enable judges to inflict appropriate sentences upon illicit traffickers residing in Egypt.

Situation in India.—The Indian delegate informed the Committee that there had been a notable improvement in the situation as regards the illicit imports of cocaine, and that this improvement was due to close co-operation between the Indian and Egyptian Governments.

Situation in Turkey.—The Turkish delegate, invited to take part in the debate, said that his Government had decided to accede to the Hague Convention of 1912, to the additional Protocol of 1914 and to the Geneva Agreement of 1925. Two of the three drug factories at Stamboul and in the neighbourhood had, he said, been closed down.

Situation in Persia.—The Belgian delegate described the working of the monopoly system for the export of raw opium. He explained the contract concluded between the Persian Government and the person holding the exclusive concession for such importation.

The Committee noted that the exports were still continuing from Bushire to Vladivostok. It noted the decision of the Persian Government to ratify the 1931 Convention on the Limitation of Manufacture and regulation of distribution of narcotics. It expressed the hope that this decision would shortly be followed by Persia's accession to the 1912 and 1925 Conventions.

Situation in China.—The Chinese delegate made a long statement describing his Government's efforts to apply the legislative and administrative measures necessary for suppressing the traffic. He drew attention to the special difficulties encountered by the Chinese Government. Large quantities of heroin had been seized by the Chinese Maritime Customs in 1930. The Committee postponed till its next session its examination of the question of concerted action by China and the Treaty Powers

in regard to the suppression of illicit traffic, as certain Governments had not yet sent in their replies.

The Committee asked the Chinese delegate to use his influence with his Government to secure full mutual co-operation between the Chinese Government and the other Governments concerned in the investigation of all important cases of seizures.

Control of Opium Smoking in the Far East. Work of the Bangkok Conference.—The results of the Bangkok Conference were discussed at length.* The Chinese delegate explained why his country had not taken part in the Conference. The latter, he said, had been summoned under Article 12 of the Geneva Agreement of 1925 to review the position concerning the gradual and effective suppression of prepared opium. China had not signed the Geneva Agreement because she had invariably held the conviction that the measures contemplated with regard to the use of prepared opium were not appropriate to the object in view, and had stated in 1925 that she could not accept any proposal which failed to give her a definite assurance that the use of prepared opium would be abolished within a clearly specified and reasonable period.

The Chinese delegate stated that he could not accept the conclusion contained in the Final Act of the Bangkok Conference to the effect that no radical measures for the suppression of opium smoking were practicable while the production and smuggling of opium continued on such an enormous scale.

The representatives of the Governments directly concerned emphasised that these Governments were doing all in their power to improve the situation and gradually to suppress the use of opium for smoking.

The representatives of certain Powers in whose territories the use of opium is still temporarily authorised protested against the accusation that the signatories of the Hague Convention were using the illicit traffic as a pretext for failing to perform their contractual obligations. They considered that they had fulfilled their obligations as far as it was possible to suppress opium smoking. The French delegate quoted figures indicating that the consumption of opium had diminished by 45 per cent., that opium dens had totally disappeared in Tonking and Annam, and that about half these establishments had been suppressed in Laos, Cambodia and Cochin China. Opium revenue only amounted to 4½ per cent. of the total budget.

The British delegate pointed out that the

British policy as regards the opium question in the Far East had been clearly stated by Lord Cecil at the Geneva Conference of 1925, when he had declared that financial reasons would not be allowed to prevent the suppression of opium smoking when that became possible. The British delegate added that so long as opium smuggling continued on a vast scale suppression would be impossible.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne further pointed out that the Bangkok Conference had noted that the difficulties in the way of the suppression of opium smoking in Far Eastern territories remained as great as in 1925.

The representatives of certain countries not parties to the Bangkok Agreement, in particular those of Italy, Spain, Belgium, the United States and Poland, and Mr. Lyall, Assessor of the Committee, expressed their regret that the Bangkok Conference had not led to more conspicuous results in the direction of the suppression of opium smoking.

The Chinese delegate and the United States observer said that, in the opinion of their Governments, the only method of suppressing the opium evil was complete legislative prohibition.

During the discussion the Indian delegate stated that his Government's policy was not based on financial considerations. It had decided to diminish by 10 per cent. the export of raw opium from India to countries which imported opium for the purpose of manufacturing the prepared opium. This decision involved an annual loss of several million pounds sterling. Moreover, India, of her own accord, had entirely prohibited the use of opium wherever this prohibition appeared administratively possible.

Preparations for a Conference to Consider the Possibility of Limiting and Controlling the Cultivation of the Opium Poppy and the Harvesting of the Coca-Leaf.—The Commission had before it two decisions: (1) that of the Council of January 22nd, 1931, requesting it to study the proposal of the Commission of Inquiry into Opium Smoking in the Far East; (2) the resolution of the Twelfth Assembly taking note of the above decision, and instructing the League to undertake as soon as possible the collection of all material that might serve as a basis for the discussions of the Conference on the Limitation of the Production of the Opium Poppy and the Cultivation and Harvesting of the Coca-Leaf.

The Committee considered that it was necessary in the first place to draw up two questionnaires, one on the opium poppy, the other on the coca-leaf. The general lines of the

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII, No. 1, p. 30.

questionnaire on the opium poppy were agreed upon; as regards that of the coca-leaf, it was decided that the delegates of Bolivia, Peru, Japan and the Netherlands, which had a particular interest in this question, and the Secretariat, should proceed to preliminary consultations.

The Committee also decided to ask the Peruvian Government for information on the cultivation of coca in Peru. The Bolivian delegate, on this occasion, declared that his country had, on April 15th, 1932, deposited with the League Secretariat the ratification of its accession to the Geneva Agreement of 1925, subject to the express reservation that Bolivia did not undertake either to restrict the production of coca or to prohibit the use of coca leaves among the native population.

The Turkish and Persian representatives, invited to take part in the discussion, stated that their Governments were disposed to discuss the principle of limitation of the cultivation of the poppy, although this measure raised serious economic and financial problems to their countries.

Other Questions.—The Advisory Committee also considered the question of the application of Article 10 of the Geneva Convention, various matters of organisation, and, in particular, that of the printing of its minutes. The publication of these documents it considered as most important in view of the desirability of affording its work the necessary publicity and obtaining the support of States distant from Geneva.

It unanimously agreed as to the necessity of holding two sessions a year, a measure already approved by the Council in May, 1931.

Approval of the Report by the Council.—The report of the Advisory Committee at its fifteenth session was submitted to the Council on May 17th by the Yugoslav delegate. The Council endorsed the conclusions of the report.

2. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

On May 10th the Council noted the report of the Committee on Traffic in Women and Children on the work of its eleventh session, and recommended it to the attention of the Members of the League.*

On this occasion the Council addressed a fresh appeal to all Governments who have not yet been in a position to ratify the 1921 Convention. It also expressed the hope that States which did not regularly report to the Secretariat on cases of the traffic in their

countries would reply to a new questionnaire which will be addressed to them.

3. CHILD WELFARE.

The work of the Child Welfare Committee at its eighth session was considered by the Council on May 18th.† In accordance with the desire expressed by the Committee, the Council decided to invite one of the countries in the Western zone of Latin America to take part in the work of the special Committee of experts studying assistance to destitute foreigners and the problem of the recognition and execution of maintenance orders abroad. The country selected was Mexico.

The Council instructed the Secretary-General to draw the attention of Governments to the importance of the establishment of paternity, of compulsory guardianship, official or private, and of international agreements simplifying the formalities and expense of marriage for foreigners, with a view to improving the situation of illegitimate children.

4. SLAVERY.

(a) *Information on Slavery.*

In 1926 the Assembly adopted a resolution inviting the Council to prepare each year, for communication to the Assembly, a document setting forth the laws and regulations forwarded to the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 7 of the Slavery Convention.

The Council was also invited to include in this document such supplementary information as States Members of the League might communicate spontaneously regarding measures taken by them with a view to the gradual abolition of slavery and other analogous conditions.

On May 9th the rapporteur to the Council pointed out that this year the League had not received any communication from Governments. This situation, he considered, was due to the fact that certain Governments had sent special information to the Committee of Experts on Slavery constituted by the last Assembly.

The Council authorised the Secretary-General to communicate to the Assembly three weeks before the opening of its ordinary session a list of such laws and regulations as may yet be forwarded, as well as any supplementary information furnished by Governments.

(b) *Committee of Experts on Slavery.*

The Committee of Experts on Slavery held its first session from May 4th to May 11th.‡

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 135.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 137.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 31.

By a resolution of the Twelfth Assembly the Council was asked to appoint a small Committee of experts for one year. Under the mandate conferred upon it by the Assembly, and further defined by the Council, the Committee was called upon to examine the information on slavery furnished by Governments, and to present a report on the question to what extent the 1926 Convention had put an end to slavery, as well as on the obstacles in the way of further progress in this direction. It had, further, to indicate by what methods assistance could be given to States desiring help in abolishing slavery in their territory. Finally, the Committee was to examine whether it was necessary to modify the existing League machinery for the purpose.

At its first session the Committee, under the presidency of M. Gohr (Belgium), studied the available material, and proceeded to an exchange of views on the principal points to be dealt with in its report to the Council. It decided to hold a second session on August 22nd, 1932, in order to draw up its report.

* * *

(c) *Contribution to the Expenditure of the Committee.**

On May 9th the Council accepted a gift of ten thousand lire offered by the Italian Anti-Slavery Society as a contribution to the expenditure occasioned by the appointment of the Committee of Experts on Slavery, under the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1931.

It instructed the Secretary-General to convey to the President of the Anti-Slavery Society its sincere thanks for this generous gift.

5. RUSSIAN REFUGEES OF GERMAN ORIGIN.

On May 19th the Peruvian representative, M. Barreto, rapporteur, made a statement

regarding the transport to certain countries of Latin America of Russian refugees of German origin living in China.

He recalled that, on September 29th, 1931, the Council had been informed by the Paraguayan delegate that his Government would be prepared to receive for settlement in the Chaco a thousand of these refugees.

The Council had asked the Secretary-General to request the International Nansen Office for Refugees to deal with this affair as soon as possible. The Bolivian Government had appeared to entertain some misgivings as to the effects of the above decision and the action of the Nansen Office on the territorial dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay.

In these circumstances, M. Barreto continued, the Secretary-General asked the Nansen Office for detailed information regarding the nature and limits of its activities for the transport and settlement in question. The reply from the Office showed that the latter was careful to refrain from interfering in territorial questions in Latin America.

The Peruvian representative stated: "Nevertheless, to obviate any uncertainty and any possible misunderstanding, I feel sure that my colleagues will agree with me that the Council did not, by its resolution of September 29th, 1931, intend to pronounce on any aspect whatever of the territorial dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay, and that, consequently, that resolution cannot be interpreted as a tacit recognition of the rights of either of these States over the territory in dispute."

At the request of the rapporteur, the Council instructed the Secretary-General to communicate this declaration to the two Governments concerned and to the Nansen Office.

X.—BUDGET AND FINANCIAL QUESTIONS.

EXPENSES OF THE LEAGUE.

By a memorandum dated May 9th the British Government drew the Council's attention to the "steady increase in the expenditure of the League of Nations, including that of the International Labour Office and the Permanent Court of International Justice."

The British Government stated that the regular increase was probably due to extended activities in matters which, though of interest

and importance in themselves, were not, perhaps, of absolute and immediate necessity.

Referring to the fact that individual countries had been compelled to make drastic economies, the British Government expressed the view that it was of the highest importance that corresponding economies should be made in the League budget. It suggested that there should be an investigation by a small special committee of outstanding men of affairs as to whether all the services undertaken were imperative and necessary, whether it was essential to employ the present amount of staff,

* Rapporteur: the British representative.

and whether the level of remuneration could be afforded.

This investigation the British Government suggested should be carried out so that the Assembly, alone competent in the matter, should be able in September to examine the question with a full knowledge of the facts.

The British Government believed that a comparison of the emoluments received by the Secretariat and the International Labour Office with those received by corresponding offices of national administrations would show that the former were generally at a substantially higher level.

The Deputy Director of the International Labour Office, Mr. Butler, drew attention to the fact that the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation had invariably exercised a vigilant financial control, and had, at its April session, instructed the Office to prepare a memorandum dealing with all the activities of the Organisation.

As regards the staff, Mr. Butler pointed out that since 1923 there had been an increase of only twenty-one posts, and that the Governing Body had, nevertheless, decided to proceed to the revision of the existing cadre.

Mr. Butler further drew the Council's attention to the constitutional aspect of the matter, observing that the International Labour Office was autonomous. Up to the present the Council had not exercised any jurisdiction in regard to the budget of the International Labour Organisation, and this was a matter which had been regarded as falling exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Assembly.

M. Hammarskjöld, Registrar of the Permanent Court, said that the purpose for which the Court had been created would be undermined if it were not always at the disposal of States or of the Council and the Assembly of the League. About seventy per cent. of the Court expenses came under the heading of salaries or indemnities to judges, which could not be reduced during their period of office without their consent.

M. Hammarskjöld felt that the Court was under-staffed. It had last year made an offer to forego its annual increments. If this offer had been accepted the question of a reduction would not have been raised afresh. In conclusion, the Registrar stated that he was prepared to submit official statistics showing the movement of the cost of living at The Hague.

Sir Eric Drummond, Secretary-General of the League, explained that the League's natural and logical development had resulted in an

increase of expenditure, though by no means in proportion to its development.

The Secretary-General further indicated that, in comparing the budgets of 1923 and 1931, the pensions fund and the wireless station accounted for a considerable part of the difference and must be taken into account.

Replying to the observations of the British representative, he explained that for the Assembly, the Council, Conferences, Committees and Secretariat the estimates for 1933 were not only less by two and a half million gold francs than the budget for 1932, but 91,000 francs below the 1931 level. This had been accomplished by the exercise of economy and pruning, and in spite of the fact that provision had been made for certain new charges amounting to one million gold francs.

The increased expenditure was due solely to the policy decided upon by the Assembly, that is, by the Governments themselves, and public opinion in many countries seemed to have the erroneous idea that the Secretary-General or the Supervisory Commission was responsible for this increase. He added that it was essential that every effort should be made to diminish the expenditure of the League, provided this could be done without curtailing its essential activities.

Speaking of the League organisation, the Secretary-General recalled that, in 1929, a Committee of Thirteen* had been constituted, and that, in 1930, the Assembly gave effect to several of its recommendations. Discussing the comparison between salaries in the Secretariat and those of civil servants, the Secretary-General said it must be remembered that the Secretariat was an international organisation, and that the scale adopted by the Assembly was based on the salaries of civil servants in certain national administrations, plus an allowance for expatriation. In his opinion comparison should be more properly made with the salaries and allowances granted to officers of the diplomatic service or of national officials seconded abroad.

Subject to the constitutional aspects of the matter, he would in no way oppose the appointment of a committee such as was recommended, whose report would only strengthen his hands and dispel ill-founded criticism which, unhappily, was too prevalent in many countries.

The Chairman of the Supervisory Commission, M. Osusky, explained the League's financial principles and practice. The Assembly alone was the supreme authority. The budget of the Permanent Court of International Justice was

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. X., No. 9, p. 192.

framed by the Court itself in accordance with its Statute, and the budget of the International Labour Office was prepared by the Governing Body of that Organisation. The establishment of the former was a purely mathematical operation, the latter budget had often been reduced by the Supervisory Commission.

Referring to the work of the Secretariat and to the number of officials, M. Osusky recalled that these questions were dependent neither upon the Supervisory Commission nor upon the Secretary-General. Once the Assembly had passed a resolution the necessary expenditure had to be provided for. The Supervisory Commission had, in all circumstances, never ceased to plead for caution. When the Assembly, in 1931, instructed it to make considerable reductions in the budget, the result of its efforts had exceeded the Assembly's expectations, and the Fourth Committee had displayed surprise at the energy with which the Commission had undertaken its task.

The Commission had hesitated to raise the question of salaries because the Committee of Thirteen the year before had declared that officials' contracts were intangible. As regards pensions, the Supervisory Commission had expressed some apprehension, but it could hardly revise a system which, only a year before, the Assembly had considered indispensable.

The Spanish representative, M. de Madariaga, said the request for reduction of expenditure was raised every year. In his opinion, it was impossible to compare national expenditure with that of a new organisation like the League, whose budget was smaller than that of any ordinary sized European town. By economising 5 per cent. of what was spent on armaments in the whole world in 1930, and by investing this sum at 5 per cent., States would for ever ensure the League's budget and its sister services.

Replying to the criticism of the British representative, M. de Madariaga pointed out that with regard to questions of general policy it was for the Assembly and the Council to decide. The League budget was strictly controlled, and he did not consider that the remuneration of the staff was too high. Comparison ought not to be made between international League officials and national officials, but between League officials and Indian civil servants or officials seconded abroad.

Referring to the constitutional difficulties raised by the British memorandum, the Spanish representative expressed some doubt as to the utility of the proposed investigation, saying that his Government could not approve it if it were to lead to a reduction of the League's activity.

Count Welczeck (Germany) welcomed the British Government's proposal and expressed the hope that it would lead to considerable reductions in expenditure. In his opinion the League organisations, which were exemplary institutions, should set the example of self-sacrifice and self-denial.

M. Scialoja (Italy) said that if it were desired to abolish one or more services or to make radical changes in the organisation, the matter must inevitably be referred to the Assembly, and the Council must pronounce itself incompetent. He feared that, in trying to live more cheaply, the League might follow the example of a poor householder who began by curtailing his children's studies and reducing his doctor's bill.

M. Paul-Boncour (France) welcomed the British proposal, but thought that it would raise numerous difficulties. The Council could not usefully investigate the working of autonomous organisations like the International Labour Office and the Court. Moreover, the Assembly was alone competent in financial matters. M. Paul-Boncour considered that the Council might accept the principle of the British proposal and request the Supervisory Commission to study the possibility of reduction. The Supervisory Commission fulfilled its duties with an energy which was of a nature to allay anxiety and afford every guarantee.

M. Garay (Panama) said that he did not claim that all the necessary expenditure on League services should be made in conformity with the legislation of States Members and their political customs. Certain countries, like Panama, were, however, in a peculiar position. Panama's officials were exposed to all the risks of public and political life, but she nevertheless contributed to the maintenance at Geneva of international officials with rights which she was unable to accord her own nationals. He proposed that the investigation should be undertaken by the Supervisory Commission.

M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia) spoke of the need of effecting economies in every direction without affecting the League's main activities or hampering its future work. He proposed the constitution of a special committee which would include the Chairman of the Supervisory Commission.

The Secretary-General, after replying to certain observations of the British representative, said that he was surprised that the British memorandum made no distinction between capital and current expenditure. He explained that the Assembly had adopted definite rules for the supervision of the League's budget; in 1930 it had adopted the report of the Committee of Thirteen. He thought that the question

of salaries was at the bottom of all the trouble ; personally he would welcome a scientific inquiry on the subject, but in his opinion it would be necessary to take into consideration several points overlooked in the British memorandum, in particular the expatriation of most of the members of the Secretariat, the cost of living in Geneva, and difficulties of promotion. Also in certain countries pensions were based on a non-contributory system, as in Great Britain, while the League pension system included contributions from salaries.

M. Yen (China) remarked that any curtailing of the League's activities, if contemplated or adopted, could only be of a temporary character, and only based upon the financial stringency prevailing throughout the world. In his opinion any reduction of staff or salaries should be quantitative rather than qualitative, for it would be disastrous if any measure were adopted which would lead to an inferior quality of service.

Mr. Eden (Great Britain) said it was evident from the discussion that there was agreement as to the imperative necessity of realising every possible economy. His Government appreciated the difficulties of this task, and it had no intention of interfering with the prerogatives of the

Assembly. The Committee entrusted with the inquiry, however constituted, should not concern itself with matters of policy, but should confine itself to considering questions of staff, salaries, and methods of control of expenditure. He had no objection to this task being entrusted to the Supervisory Commission, and would merely ask the Council to lend it the assistance of several experts.

After a discussion between M. Nagaoka (Japan), M. Andvord (Norway), M. Massigli (France), M. de Madariaga (Spain), M. Osusky, Chairman of the Supervisory Commission, the Council unanimously adopted the report of M. Matos (Guatemala).

M. Matos stated that if public criticism of League expenditure existed in Great Britain and other countries, it was right that every effort should be made to dispel any suspicion and bring forward the facts in their true light. He specified that the Supervisory Commission should confine itself to examining the possibility of reducing staff and salaries and to instituting a stricter control of expenditure.

The Council expressed the view that the Supervisory Commission might seek the assistance of two or three experts.

XI.—OTHER QUESTIONS.

I. OBITUARY.

Tribute to the Memory of the President of the French Republic, of M. Albert Thomas, Director of the International Labour Office, and of M. Inukai, Prime Minister of Japan.

A solemn tribute was paid on May 9th by the President of the Council to the memory of M. Paul Doumer, President of the French Republic, and of M. Albert Thomas, Director of the International Labour Office.

On behalf of his colleagues, the President expressed the horror felt by the Council at the dastardly outrage to which the President of the French Republic had succumbed. He begged the French representative to convey the Council's deepest condolences and warmest sympathy to the French Government and to Madame Paul Doumer.

* * *

The President then spoke of M. Albert Thomas, whom death had overtaken in the plenitude of his activity. He recalled his untiring enthusiasm for work, the energy of his mind, his devotion to the cause of the

peoples, his faith in a future social justice; His disappearance was, he said, an immense loss for the International Labour Office, and for his country.

The Secretary-General also said a few words on behalf of the Secretariat. For more than twelve years he had worked together with Albert Thomas in unbroken harmony. His loss, he said, would be deeply felt among all who looked forward to a betterment of international life.

Albert Thomas, he said, never wavered in his efforts to heighten the standard of working conditions, to improve relations between employers and labour, and to prevail upon Governments to adopt new measures of social reform. He greatly furthered the cause of the League of Nations in all the many journeys he undertook, during which he strove unceasingly and successfully to give practical effect to the ideals which he so strongly held.

He has sacrificed his life to the cause for which he stood, as after a severe illness he insisted on continuing to the full the strenuous activities of his official life. He was more than the Director of the International Labour Office,

he was the leader and inspirer of the whole organisation.

M. Paul-Boncour said that for the second time in a few months it had fallen to his lot to express on behalf of his country the gratitude he felt for the words of condolence and sympathy addressed to it. France, he said, had been stricken in the person of the first Magistrate of the Republic who, in that capacity, was the embodiment of her entire people.

He recalled the interest which M. Paul Doumer had taken in the work of the League and, more particularly, in that of the Disarmament Conference. As President of the Republic, he personified the principles by which French foreign policy was permanently guided, and which aimed at enhancing the prestige of the League, at developing and strengthening it. In M. Paul Doumer's case there was another, a special reason for this interest, a human and deep-seated reason: war, against which the League had to fight, had robbed him of four of his sons.

Speaking of M. Albert Thomas, the French representative said: "Having achieved the highest political ambitions and having the prospect of achieving yet others, he devoted his life to service as a great official, as a great Ambassador, to one of those international administrations which certainly constitute the most definite and the best of joint efforts."

The meeting was suspended for some minutes as a sign of mourning.

* * *

At the Council meeting on May 19th the Acting President of the Council, M. Matos, expressed to the Japanese representative the Council's grief at the outrage of which the Prime Minister of Japan, M. Inukai, had been a victim.

The Japanese representative thanked the Council, saying that his Government would warmly appreciate this unanimous and spontaneous expression of sympathy.

2. APPOINTMENTS.

Appointments to the Opium Advisory Committee.—The Council renewed the appointments of Mr. L. A. Lyall and Mr. A. H. Sirks as assessors to the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium for the period ending May 31st, 1933.

Appointment to the Permanent Central Opium Board.—The Council appointed Sir Atul Chatterjee (India) to replace Dr. Henrik Ramsay (Finnish) on the Permanent Central Opium Board.

Appointment to the Fiscal Committee.—The Council appointed Dr. Enrique Hernandez Cartaya, former Minister of Finance, as Cuban corresponding member of the Fiscal Committee.

Appointment to the Financial Committee.—The Council appointed M. Dayras, Inspector of Finances, Director of Technical Services of the Cabinet of the French Finance Minister, to succeed M. de Chalendar as Member of the Financial Committee.

XII.—LIBRARY QUESTIONS.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINCIPAL VOLUMES ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, CATALOGUED IN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS LIBRARY FROM JANUARY TO MAY, 1932.

General and Political (including Disarmament and Minorities).

ALVAREZ, A.

L'organisation internationale. Précédents de la Société des Nations et de l'Union fédérale européenne. Paris, Editions internationales, 1931. 357 pp.

Survey of the various schemes and ideas for an international organisation on a continental basis, followed by studies regarding

the amendment of the Covenant of the League of Nations on regional lines and the relations between the European Union and the Pan-American Union.

ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA PER LA SOCIETÀ DELLE NAZIONI.

La Conferenza generale per il Disarmo. Rome, Anonima Romana Editoriale, 1932. 132 pp.

Development of the problem of disarmament within the League of Nations up to the beginning of the Conference.

BÖHMERT, V.

Die Rechtsgrundlagen für Deutschlands Recht auf Abrüstung seiner Vertragsgegner. Berlin, Ebering, 1931. 59 pp.

Analysis of the relationship between Article 8 of the Covenant and Part V of the Treaty of Versailles.

CASULLI, A.

La sovranità degli Stati e la Società delle Nazioni. Rome, Casa editrice "Avsonia," 1932. 188 pp.

After an analysis of the juridical and political aspects of sovereignty and its relationship with the League of Nations, the International Labour Office, and the Permanent Court, the author explains his new theory of sovereignty as it exists for the Members of the League of Nations.

ESTIENNY, P.

La Conférence générale du désarmement réussira-t-elle? Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1932. 151 pp.

Studies of the disarmament of the vanquished Powers, the Conferences of Washington, Rome, Geneva and London, the work of the Preparatory Commission, and the Draft Convention.

GALABERT, H.

La Commission de Coopération Intellectuelle de la Société des Nations. Toulouse, Lion et fils, 1931. 240 pp.

After studying the historical precedents for intellectual co-operation, the author examines the history, organisation, and work of the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and its sub-committees.

MANNING, C. A. W.

The Policies of the British Dominions in the League of Nations. London, Oxford University Press. Geneva, Kundig, 1932. 159 pp.

After explaining the status of the Dominions in the League of Nations, the author analyses their policy in the Council and Assembly in respect of the political and economical problems which have been dealt with by the League of Nations.

OTTLIK, G.

La Société des Nations et le désarmement. Geneva, Editions de l'Annuaire de la Société des Nations, 1932. 165 pp.

Analysis of the documents concerning disarmament published by the League of Nations.

TOLÉDANO, A. D.

Ce qu'il faut savoir sur le désarmement. Paris, Pedone, 1932. 264 pp.

Evolution and present position of the question of disarmament; legal and technical work carried out by the League of Nations with a view to preparing for a reduction and limitation of armaments; results already obtained outside the League in the domain of naval armaments.

Legal.

CALOGEROPOULOS STRATIS, S.

Le Pacte général de renonciation à la guerre. Paris, Rivière, 1931. 246 pp.

After studying the history, structure, and scope of the Paris Pact, the author discusses its influence on the problems of a war to enforce sanctions, and on the problems of legitimate defence and neutrality, and gives a summary of the question of harmonising the Covenant of the League with the Paris Pact.

FRANKE, R.

Der Wirtschaftskampf dargestellt an Hand seiner historischen Entwicklung und in seiner Verwendung als Sanktionsmittel nach Artikel 16 des Völkerbundpakts. Leipzig, R. Noske, 1931. 121 pp.

Analysis of the possibilities of sanctions under Article 16 of the Covenant, especially economic sanctions.

KUNZ, J. L.

Die intrasystematische Stellung des Art. XI. des Völkerbundpaktes. Leipzig, R. Noske, 1931. 143 pp.

Article 11 of the Covenant: survey of the cases in which this Article has been applied in practice; procedure; relationship between Article 11 and the other Articles of the Covenant for the prevention of conflicts.

LINDSEY, E.

The International Court. New York, T. Y. Crowell, 1931. 347 pp.

Organisation, methods, and achievements of the Permanent Court.

PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

Ten years of international jurisdiction (1922-1932). Dix ans de juridiction internationale (1922-1932). Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff, 1932. 74 pp.

Organisation, jurisdiction, and work of the Court in the first ten years of its existence.

SCHRÖDER, M.

Die Grundbuchfähigkeit des Völkerbundes. Berlin, Rothschild, 1932. 84 pp.

The position of the League of Nations in international private law. The right to acquire immovable property. The organs representing the League and the acquisition of immovable property.

SCHÜCKING, W.

Die Revision der Völkerbundssatzung im Hinblick auf den Kelloggpaht. Berlin, E. Ebering, 1931. 43 pp.

Analysis of the work of the Committee for amending the Covenant of the League of Nations so as to bring it into harmony with the Paris Pact (1930).

VÁLI, F.

Die deutsch-österreichische Zollunion vor dem Ständigen Internationalen Gerichtshof. Wien, Manzsche Verlags- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1932. 149 pp.

After discussing the manner in which the Court operates, its procedure, and in particular the question of national judges, the author analyses more especially the problem of the Austro-German Customs Union as dealt with before the Permanent Court of International Justice.

WFBELR, P.

Die Verteidigungspflicht der Gliedstaaten des Völkerbundes nach den Normen des Völkerbundsvertrages. Zürich, Leeman, 1932. 224 pp.

After studying the relationship between Article 8 of the Covenant (reduction of armaments) and Articles 10 and 16 (guarantee of the territorial integrity of the States Members), the author analyses more particu-

larly the question of disarmament as it affects Switzerland (neutrality).

Economic.

SALTER, SIR J. A.

Recovery, the Second Effort. London, G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1932. 306 pp.

Diplomatic and economic history of the last twelve years—attempt to indicate the main tendencies—forecast of the future.

WOERDEN, F. A. VAN.

La Société des nations et le rapprochement économique international. La Haye, M. Nijhoff, 1932. 298 pp.

After reviewing the general post-war economic situation, the author analyses the financial and economic activities of the League of Nations and its work in the domain of communications and transit.

Mandates.

BENTWICH, N.

England in Palestine. London, K. Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1932. 358 pp.

After discussing the relations between England and Palestine prior to 1914, the author reviews the various stages in the administration of Palestine, devoting special attention to the question of government by mandate.

RAJA GABAGLIA, F. A.

Dos mandatos internacionais (o artigo 22 do Pacto da Sociedade das nações). Rio, Typ. d' "A Encadernadora," 1930. 118 pp., map.

After examining the question of the origin of mandates, the author studies the various problems which have arisen: sovereignty of mandated territories, financial administration, Permanent Mandates Commission, etc.

XIII.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

June 16th.—Committee of Library Experts, Paris.

July 1st.—Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

July 12th.—Delegation of the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League, Geneva.

July 15th.—Executive and Directors Committee of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

July 18th.—Fourteenth plenary session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and Ninth Session of Governing Body of

the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

August 22nd.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

September 2nd.—Sixty-eighth session of the Council, Geneva.

September 5th.—Thirteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva.

October 17th.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

1. THE FREE ZONES OF UPPER SAVOY AND THE DISTRICT OF GEX.

The Court continued its deliberations on the case concerning the Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex.

2. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND.

The Danish Government has appointed as Counsel and Advocate, in addition to M. Steglich-Petersen, M. Charles de Visscher, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Ghent, and, as Advocate, M. N. V. Boeg, President of the Greco-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

The Norwegian Government has appointed as Agent and Counsel, in addition to MM. Sunde and Gidel, M. Per Rygh, Advocate to the Supreme Court of Norway.

3. INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE OF MEMEL.

(a) *Merits.*

The Lithuanian Government filed its Counter-Memorial on May 31st, 1932. The President decided, under the terms of Art. 33 of the Rules, to regard this proceeding as valid, notwithstanding the fact that it was effected after the expiration of the time-limit fixed. The hearings have been fixed to begin on June 8th.

(b) *Jurisdiction.*

On May 31st, the Lithuanian Government also filed an objection to the jurisdiction in this case; this objection relates to the two last of the six points enumerated in the Application instituting proceedings.

4. INTERPRETATION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1919 CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN DURING THE NIGHT.

By a resolution adopted on May 9th, 1932, the Council asked the Court to give an advisory opinion on the following question:

"Does the Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted in 1919 by the International Labour Conference, apply, in the industrial undertakings covered by the said Convention, to women who hold positions of

supervision or management and are not ordinarily engaged in manual work?"

A request for an advisory opinion was consequently addressed to the Court on May 10th.

The request of the Council has been notified to Members of the League and to the other States admitted to appear before the Court. Furthermore, in accordance with the second paragraph of No. 1 of Article 73 of the Rules of Court, the Registrar also notified, by means of a special and direct communication, the international organisations mentioned below which have been considered as likely to be able to furnish information on the question before the Court that the latter was prepared to receive written statements from them.

International Labour Organisation.

International Organisation of Industrial Employers.

International Federation of Trades Union.

International Confederation of Christian Trades Unions.

These communications were sent in execution of an Order, made by the President on May 27th, 1932, fixing August 1st, 1932, as the date by which written statements may be presented, and September 12th, 1932, as the date by which second written statements are to be presented if, when the time comes, the submission of the latter is authorised.

5. "PRINCE OF PLESS ADMINISTRATION."

On May 8th, 1932, the German Minister at The Hague filed with the Registrar of the Court an application instituting proceedings. This application, based on various articles in the German-Polish Convention concerning Upper Silesia, signed at Geneva on May 15th, 1922, submits to the Court certain questions relating to the attitude of the Polish Government and Polish authorities towards the "Prince of Pless Administration," viz., more particularly, measures taken by the Polish fiscal authorities and the consequences of these measures, as well as the right of the "Prince of Pless Administration" freely to engage its employees and workmen, regardless of race and language.

The application of the German Government has been communicated to Members of the League and to other States admitted to appear before the Court; on the same day as it was

* This article has been compiled on the basis of information from the Registry of the Court.

filed, it was notified to the Polish Government through the Polish Minister at The Hague.

The German Government has appointed as its Agent in the case *Professor Erich Kaufmann*, of Berlin.

By an Order, dated May 31st, 1932, the President of the Court fixed the following time limits for the written proceedings :

July 15th, 1932, for the German Government's Memorial ;

September 1st, 1932, for the Polish Government's Counter-Memorial ;

October 1st, 1932, for the German Government's reply ;

November 1st, 1932, for the Polish Government's rejoinder.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

Just out :

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION

Eighth year, 1932

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, IX, 35)

430 pages Price : 20 Swiss francs

The new edition of the Statistical Year-book of the Trade in Arms and Ammunition contains information with regard to the export and import of arms and ammunition in fifty-nine countries and forty-nine colonies. The tables appearing in the last edition but one have all been revised, brought up to date and supplemented from the most recent documents.

The Statistical Year-book of the Trade in Arms and Ammunition is divided into three parts. The first and third parts contain information relating to the trade in arms and ammunition of each country separately, the values of exports and imports being expressed in the national currency of each country. The second part contains a number of statistical tables in which the countries are arranged in alphabetical order, the value of exports and imports being given in United States dollars. The percentages given in these tables show the share of world trade in arms and ammunition of each of the countries.

At the end of the volume will be found a bibliography of official publications only, on the basis of which the statistical tables for the various countries have been compiled.

Published previously :

ARMAMENTS YEAR-BOOK, 1932

Eighth Year

Special Edition

General and Statistical Information

474 pages Price : in wrappers, 10 Swiss francs
Bound in cloth. Out of print

This special edition is a source of information, not only for delegates to the Conference, but also for all others who are anxious to follow closely the work of the Conference.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON DISARMAMENT AND MILITARY QUESTIONS

163 pages Price 2s. \$0.50

This work has been prepared by the Political and Legal Reference Service of the League of Nations Library to supply information on the principal publications which have appeared in connection with disarmament and on a selection of works dealing with military questions. Brief summaries are given of the contents of the works mentioned.

Complete Catalogue sent free of charge on application.

**LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA**

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 6.

JUNE, 1932

Reduction of Armaments.

Message from the President of the United States.

Economic and Financial Questions.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 6.

JUNE, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month : June, 1932</i>	182	VII. <i>Other Questions :</i>	
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments ..</i>	182	1. The League Library . . .	199
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions : International Engagements, Registration of Treaties . . .</i>	186	2. The League Wireless Station .	200
IV. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		VIII. <i>Bibliographical Notes :</i>	
1. The Economic and Financial Organisation :		1. Economic and Financial Publications :	
(a) Thirty-eighth Session of the Economic Committee .	187	(a) Review of World Production, 1925-1931 . . .	200
(b) Customs Nomenclature .	192	(b) World Economic Survey, 1931-32 . . .	200
(c) Meeting of the Financial Committee . . .	192	(c) The Timber Problem ..	200
(d) Report of the Gold Delegation	193	2. Traffic in Women :	
(e) Meeting of the Delegation of the Financial Committee and the Government Experts	195	(a) Elimination of the Age Limit	200
2. Communications and Transit : Seventeenth Session of the Committee	195	(b) Central Authorities . . .	201
V. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>		IX. <i>Forthcoming Meetings . . .</i>	201
1. Conference of Institutes for the Scientific Study of International Relations . . .	197		
2. Intellectual Property . . .	197		
3. Meeting of Library Experts .	197		
VI. <i>Political Questions :</i>			
1. Appeal of the Chinese Government	198		
2. Request of the Liberian Government	199		
3. Frontier between Iraq and Syria	199		

The Permanent Court of International Justice.

1. Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex	202
2. Interpretation of the Statute of Memel	202
3. Legal Status of certain parts of Eastern Greenland	205
4. Delimitation of the territorial waters between the Island of Castellorizo and the Coasts of Anatolia . . .	205
5. Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 concerning the Employment of Women during the Night . . .	206
6. Communication of Treaties	206

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

June, 1932.

The Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments pursued its work in June, the most noteworthy event being the presentation by the American delegation of a definite proposal for the reduction of the armaments of the world by nearly one-third. This proposal was included in the programme of the private conversations at present proceeding among delegations.

In addition to the question of the reduction and limitation of armaments, the economic and financial situation was the principal subject which engaged the League's attention in June. The Economic Committee held a meeting from June 2nd to 4th, when it dealt with present conditions of international trade and the situation of certain branches of production such as coal, hops, timber, and motor vehicles.

The Mixed Committee of the Financial Committee and Government Experts, appointed by the President of the Council to consider the questions raised in the general part of the recent report of the Financial Committee, as well as the appeal of the Austrian Government, met in Paris, Geneva, and, finally, in Lausanne, where the Committee heard the representatives

of the Austrian Government and of the Austrian National Bank.

This meeting was followed by a plenary meeting of the Financial Committee in Geneva.

The Advisory Committee on Communications and Transit held its seventeenth session, the questions on the agenda being passport formalities, air transport co-operation, the jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube, appeals from certain railway companies, and the League wireless station.

The work on intellectual co-operation was marked by a conference of institutes for the scientific study of international relations, and meetings of representatives of institutes dealing with intellectual rights and of library experts.

The Commission on the Syro-Iraqi frontier met at Geneva at the beginning of June to prepare its report.

A representative of the League left for Liberia to study questions in connection with the pacification of the Kroo district.

The Permanent Court of International Justice delivered its final judgment in the case concerning the Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the district of Gex.

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

By its resolution of April 22nd, the General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments had instructed the competent special commissions to study and report on a series of land, sea and air armaments, with a view to determining those of the most specifically offensive character, those most efficacious against national defence, and those most threatening to civilians.

On May 27th the Naval Commission presented its report. On June 6th the Land Commission adopted its report on artillery material, armoured vehicles and fortifications. On June 8th the Air Commission, and on May 31st the Special Committee on Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare terminated their reports. The report of the latter contained several draft resolutions to be submitted to the General Commission: (1) on chemical arms and means of warfare; (2) on bacteriological arms and means of warfare; (3) on incendiary projectiles; (4) on flame projectors.

On June 9th a joint meeting of the bureaux of the three Commissions (Land, Naval and Air) and of the Special Committee on Chemical

and Bacteriological Weapons expressed the view that, apart from the question of aircraft carriers, which concerns both the Naval and Air Commissions, there was no reason to co-ordinate the four reports. The latter were, accordingly, forwarded to the President of the Conference. On June 14th the Bureau of the Conference, after examining the four reports, invited the delegations to resume private conversations with a view to settling certain questions of principle raised in these documents.

Several delegations, including those of the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, accordingly proceeded to exchanges of views.

On June 21st the head of the American delegation, Mr. Gibson, requested, on behalf of the President of the United States, the immediate convocation of the General Commission, to which he desired to communicate a declaration which the President of the United States intended to make the next day to the American people.

On June 22nd Mr. Gibson read to the Commission the following instructions issued by

President Hoover to the United States delegation for guidance in the discussions.

"The delegations at the World Conference on Disarmament at Geneva are now engaged in discussions as to methods by which more comprehensive efforts can be made toward disarmament.

"The following is the substance of instructions which have been given by the President to the American delegation for guidance in the discussions which are now occupying them. They are published in order that the American people may be fully and accurately informed.

"The time has come when we should cut through the brush and adopt some broad and definite method of reducing the overwhelming burden of armament which now lies upon the toilers of the world. This would be the most important world step that could be taken to expedite economic recovery. We must make headway against the mutual fear and friction arising out of war armament which kill human confidence throughout the world. We can still remain practical in maintaining an adequate self-defence among all nations. We can add to the assurances of peace and yet save the people of the world from ten to fifteen billions of wasted dollars during the next ten years.

"I propose that the following principles should be our guide.

"First: The Briand-Kellogg Pact to which we are all signatories can only mean that the nations of the world have agreed that they will use their arms solely for defence.

"Second: This reduction should be carried out not only by broad general cuts in armaments but by increasing the comparative power of defence through decreases in the power of the attack.

"Third: The armaments of the world have grown up in mutual relation to each other. And, speaking generally, such relativity should be preserved in making reductions.

"Fourth: The reductions must be real and positive. They must effect economic relief.

"Fifth: There are three problems to deal with—land, air forces and naval forces. They are all inter-connected. No part of the proposals which I make can be disassociated one from the other.

"Based on these principles, I propose that the arms of the world should be reduced by nearly one-third.

Land Forces.

"In order to reduce the offensive character of all land forces as distinguished from their defensive character, I propose the adoption of the presentation already made at the Geneva Conference for the abolition of all tanks, all chemical warfare and all large mobile guns. This would not prevent the establishment or increase of fixed fortifications of any character for the defence of frontiers and sea-coasts. It would give an increased relative strength to such defence as compared with attack.

"I propose, furthermore, that there should be a reduction of one-third in strength of all land armies over and above the so-called police component.

"The land armaments of many nations are considered to have two functions. One is the maintenance of internal order in connection with the regular police forces of the country. The strength required for this purpose has been called the 'police component.' The other function is defence against foreign attack. The additional strength required for this purpose has been called the 'defence component.' While it is not suggested that these different components should be separated, it is necessary to consider this contention as to functions in proposing a practical plan of reduction in land forces. Under the Treaty of Versailles and the other peace treaties, the armies of Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria were reduced to a size deemed appropriate for the maintenance of internal order, Germany being assigned one hundred thousand troops for a population of approximately sixty-five million people. I propose that we should accept for all nations a basic police component of soldiers proportionate to the average which was thus allowed Germany and these other States. This formula with necessary corrections for Powers having colonial possessions should be sufficient to provide for the maintenance of internal order by the nations of the world. Having analysed these two components in this fashion, I propose, as stated above, that there should be a reduction of one-third in the strength of all land armies over and above the police component.

Air Forces.

"All bombing-planes to be abolished. This will do away with the military possession of types of planes capable of attacks upon civil populations and should be coupled with the total prohibition of all bombardment from the air.

Naval Forces.

"I propose that the treaty number and tonnage of battleships shall be reduced by one-third; that the treaty tonnage of aircraft-carriers, cruisers and destroyers shall be reduced by one-fourth; that the treaty tonnage of submarines shall be reduced by one-third and that no nation shall retain a submarine tonnage greater than 35,000 tons.

"The relative strength of naval arms in battleships and aircraft-carriers as between the five leading naval Powers was fixed by the Treaty of Washington.

"The relative strength in cruisers, destroyers and submarines was fixed as between the United States, Great Britain and Japan by the Treaty of London. For the purpose of this proposal it is suggested that the French and Italian strength in cruisers and destroyers be calculated as though they had joined in the Treaty of London on a basis approximating the so-called accord of March 1st, 1931.

"There are various technical considerations connected with these naval reductions which will be presented by the delegation at Geneva.

General.

"The effect of this plan would be to bring an enormous saving in cost of new construction and replacement of naval vessels. It would also save large amounts in the operating expense in all nations of land, sea and air forces. It

would greatly reduce offensive strength compared to defensive strength in all nations.

"These proposals are simple and direct. They call upon all nations to contribute something. The contribution here proposed will be relative and mutual. I know of nothing that would give more hope for humanity to-day than the acceptance of such a programme with such minor changes as might be necessary. It is folly for the world to go on breaking its back over military expenditures, and the United States is willing to take its share of responsibility by making definite proposals that will relieve the world."

* * *

Mr. Gibson added :

"The significance of this statement by the President will be apparent to all. It is clear, self-contained, and comprehensive. I am well aware that everyone here will wish to study it in detail. There are, however, certain clarifications and explanations which I can make at once in order to clear up one or two points.

"With reference to cruiser strength, it is proposed that the 25 per cent. reduction of the total tonnage of the United States and Great Britain should be calculated on the present total London Treaty tonnage of Great Britain—namely, 339,000 tons. Furthermore, the total tonnage allowed under that Treaty for eight-inch-gun cruisers shall be limited to 150,000 tons each for the United States and Great Britain and the proportionate 90,000 tons for Japan.

"I also feel that there should be a clarification on the subject of submarines. In order to make the acceptance of such a sweeping reduction possible, the President's communication is on the basis that no nation, whether or not a party to existing naval treaties, shall retain a tonnage in submarines greater than 35,000 tons or more than 40 submarine units of which no single vessel shall exceed 1,200 tons.

"In view of the reductions suggested for the five leading naval Powers under the President's plans, it seems evident that the other Powers should here agree to corresponding sacrifices through the reduction or limitation of their naval armaments.

"I have not laboured here all these months with my colleagues present to-day without becoming convinced of their earnestness of purpose and their desire to see the greatest possible accomplishment in disarmament. Therefore, I am sure that the principle of maximum accomplishment to which each nation makes substantial contributions, as my country is doing by the provisions of the text which I have just read, will appeal to them.

"In our most powerful arm, the navy, we are prepared, as a part of this general programme, to scrap over 300,000 tons of existing ships and to forgo the right to build over 50,000 tons. In land material our proposal would affect over a thousand heavy mobile guns and approximately 900 tanks, and in aviation about 300 bombardment airplanes.

"The American delegation is at your disposal for further explanations and clarifications as they may become necessary, and these points will, no doubt, be forthcoming as the conversations

in which we are now engaged progress. These very real sacrifices of strength which the United States is willing to make in a predominant arm as part of a world scheme cannot fail, I am convinced, to find equally generous response."

The communication of this message was followed by a discussion. The British representative, Sir John Simon, congratulated Mr. Gibson on the notable contribution he had made to the work, and recalled that for several days informal conversations had been in progress between the American, British and French delegations with a view to reaching agreement by mutual concessions, and an adjustment of the various points of view.

After submitting observations of a general character, Sir John Simon said that his delegation would consider the part of the American scheme concerning effectives with sympathetic attention; while noting that various aspects of the air problem had been considered in more detail during the informal conversations than in Mr. Hoover's proposal, he thanked the United States delegation for drawing attention to this question.

As regards the naval proposals, he was not quite sure whether they were in some respects adequate, and in other respects appropriate to the varying circumstances of different naval Powers. As regards submarines, for example, the British delegation desired their entire abolition or, in any case, their limitation to a maximum tonnage of 250 tons. As regards capital ships, the American proposal made no provision for reducing their present size. The British delegation desired the reduction to twenty-five thousand tons of the maximum tonnage of thirty-five thousand tons fixed by the London Treaty of 1930. It also wished gun calibre to be reduced from sixteen to twelve inches.

M. Paul Boncour (France) welcomed with interest and sympathy the proposals of President Hoover, which he considered as clear, direct and simple—perhaps too simple in view of the complexity of certain problems. The British delegate had placed the proposals within the framework of the conversations at that moment in progress. M. Paul Boncour explained that it was considered essential to put together a minimum programme on which agreement might be reached with a view to a first step towards the reduction and limitation of armaments in present conditions of security. More important and substantial reductions, the French delegation was convinced, would invariably be considered as bound up with the organisation of a system of international security. If the General Commission decided

to study the American proposal, M. Paul Boncour would ask that it should proceed to a correlative study of the proposals concerning international security. Moreover, the American plan was based upon the application of a uniform scale which might involve injustices, particularly in the case of small or new States, or of those which had already proceeded of their own accord to a diminution of their armaments. M. Paul-Boncour concluded by noting that the American delegation had, in his opinion rightly, introduced the proposals by mentioning the Briand-Kellogg Pact. He would, however, ask his colleagues what would happen if nations chose to make use of their arms for aggressive and not only for defensive purposes.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics) stated that he was far from ignoring the work of the technical commissions, but expressed some doubt as to its usefulness for the purposes of the Conference. He welcomed with satisfaction the American proposals which, to some extent, coincided in their main lines with those which the Soviet delegation had put forward and which had not been accepted.

M. Nadolny (Germany) expressed his satisfaction at the step taken by the President of the United States. The diminution of the aggressive power of nations would make it possible to achieve the security demanded by all States and promised to them under Article 8 of the Covenant. The principle of reduction could not be applied mechanically and without taking account of the situation of nations which had already disarmed. He considered the American proposals as very moderate, and hoped that the Conference would achieve still more decisive reductions with a view to facilitating the settlement of the problem of establishing equality of rights, as provided by the Covenant. The establishment of such equality was an essential condition of the final success of the Conference.

M. Matsudaira (Japan) expressed his appreciation of the American proposals, but recalled that on land and air forces informal conversations were proceeding which would doubtless lead to practical results. As regards naval armaments, he observed that the Japanese Government had accepted the maxima fixed by the London Treaty only up to 1936. Any modification of the Washington and London Treaties must be preceded by a full exchange of views between the Powers directly concerned.

M. Grandi (Italy), on behalf of the head of the Italian Government, announced that his country accepted the American proposals both in principle and in their practical consequences, and, more particularly, the following measures :

(a) *For land armaments :*

1. The abolition of heavy mobile artillery ;
2. The total abolition of tanks ;
3. The reduction of effectives on the basis of the principles indicated,

(b) *For naval armaments :*

1. The reduction by one-third of the number and total tonnage of cruisers as established by the treaties in force ;
2. The reduction by one-fourth of the tonnage of aircraft carriers ;
3. The reduction by one-fourth of the figures laid down for cruisers and destroyers by the Treaty of London of 1930 and by the bases of the Italian-French-British-Agreement of March 1st, 1931 ;
4. The reduction by one-third of submarine tonnage as established by the Treaty of London of 1930, and the limitation to 35,000 tons of the maximum total tonnage possessed by any Power.

(c) *For air armaments :*

The abolition of bombing aircraft and the prohibition of all bombardment from the air.

(d) *For all armaments :*

The abolition of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

He hoped that all the countries represented would respond to the appeal made by President Hoover to their good sense and to their goodwill.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) welcomed President Hoover's message as a valuable contribution to the work of the Conference. He pointed out that in the reductions contemplated some relativity was necessary, in particular as regards navies constituting organic bodies. Spain was prepared to approve entirely the American proposals, and would even go further on certain points. She desired, in particular, the total abolition of military aviation and the internationalisation of civil aviation in Europe, budget reduction, the control of arms manufacture, in connection with an inventory of stocks, and the supervision of the international trade in arms. The Spanish delegation believed that disarmament would be effective only to the extent to which institutions were developed for the organisation of peace.

After an exchange of views between the President and Sir John Simon, the Commission confirmed the decision taken by the Bureau with regard to conversations between delegations ; it was decided that M. Gibson's declaration should be one of the subjects dealt with in these conversations. The President expressed the hope that the exchanges of views would soon be terminated, and that the General

Commission could, before its summer recess, reach decisions on certain of the important problems which had engaged the attention of the Conference.

* * *

During June the Naval Commission discussed certain parts of the draft Convention drawn up in 1930 by the Preparatory Commission. A Sub-Committee, including representatives of the American, Brazilian, British, Finnish, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Netherlands, Polish, Roumanian, Soviet and Swedish delegations was instructed to examine certain points left in abeyance during the discussion. On June 11th this Sub-Committee submitted a report constituting a provisional statement of the position as regards the work of the Commission. This report was noted by the latter.

* * *

The Air Commission began its technical study of prospects and methods for the internationalisation of civil aviation in relation to decisions to be taken on the question of the abolition or the reduction and limitation of military aviation.

It instructed a Sub-Committee (its Bureau and the American, Argentine, Belgian, British, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Netherlands, Polish, Soviet and Swedish delegations) to submit a definite scheme.

* * *

The Commission on National Defence Expenditure did not hold any plenary meetings, but its technical Committee continued its examination of the material deposited by the various countries. This study is already terminated as regards Switzerland, the United Kingdom, India, Sweden (France is now under discussion).

Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Germany, Belgium, the United States, Italy, Netherlands, South Africa and Norway.

* * *

On June 9th the Special Committee on Effectives submitted for decision by the General Commission certain points of the definition of effectives in regard to which it had been unable to reach agreement.

On June 14th the Conference Bureau requested Dr. Benes, rapporteur of the General Commission, Mr. Gibson (United States), and M. de Brouckère, Chairman of the Committee on Effectives, to submit a report on the text of the resolution on effectives adopted by the Commission on May 10th.

* * *

The Committee on Moral Disarmament made a preliminary examination of a text concerning education, co-operation of intellectual circles, broadcasting, and the cinematograph in relation to moral disarmament, and instructed a small legal Sub-Committee to study a memorandum concerning the adaptation of national laws to the development of international life. A Press Sub-Committee met at the end of June and considered a Polish proposal for the convocation of an international conference of qualified press representatives to examine the question of moral disarmament in so far as it was of interest to the press.

The Chairman, M. Perrier, asked the Polish delegation and M. de Brouckère to confer with the President of the Association of Journalists accredited to the League, on the question whether it was necessary to amplify the Polish draft declaration from the point of view of journalists.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

Registration of Treaties.

Among the international engagements registered in June figure the following treaties and agreements:

A Convention on Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement (Geneva, September 24th, 1930) between Belgium and Lithuania, presented by Belgium; an Arbitration and Conciliation Treaty (February 16th, 1931) between the United States and Switzerland, presented by Switzerland;

A Convention on Commerce and Navigation (Lisbon, November 13th, 1931) between Norway and Portugal, presented by both parties; a

Convention on Commerce and Navigation, an Establishment Convention, and a Veterinary Convention (Bucarest, August 11th, 1931) between Greece and Roumania, presented by Greece; a Treaty of Commerce (Helsinki, November 11th, 1930) between Finland and Norway, presented by Norway;

A Convention concerning acts of procedure in civil and commercial matters (London, July 9th, 1931) between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Portugal, presented by Great Britain; an Exchange of Notes concerning the revision of the regulations for conditions of service of members of the Mixed Tribunal of the Condominium of the New Hebrides (Paris, December 15th, 1931) between

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France, presented by Great Britain; Convention of Extradition and Judicial Assistance in Penal Matters (Warsaw, August 30th, 1930) between Poland and Sweden, presented by Sweden;

A Protocol concerning Greek churches and schools in Roumania (Bucarest, August 11th, 1931), with an Exchange of Notes of the same date, signed by Greece and Roumania, presented by Greece.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

I. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Thirty-eighth Session of the Economic Committee.*

The Economic Committee met at Geneva from June 2nd to 4th, under the presidency of M. Schuller (Austria). Its work bore especially upon present conditions of international trade and the situation of certain branches of production, such as coal, hops, timber, and motor vehicles.

1. *Aggravation of the position of international trade.*

On the basis of a study undertaken by the Section for Economic Relations and of the discussions of its June session, the Committee prepared a report for the Council, which may be summarised as follows.

* * *

In the first place, the Economic Committee recalls that in January, 1932, it drew attention to the harm which the weakening of credit, monetary difficulties and various government restrictions had inflicted on international trade, already subjected to a heavy strain by a depression which had been dragging on for two years. The situation has since grown worse. The value of international trade to-day is only one-half, or perhaps less than half, what it was in the first quarter of 1929. During the same period the number of wholly unemployed persons has more than doubled. According to the figures of the International Labour Office, from twenty to twenty-five million persons are now without work. The situation is growing worse from day to day, and the world is awaiting with dread what the morrow will bring forth.

To cope with the situation, all countries have applied all the means in their power to prevent their national economy from being affected by the general depression. The forces of propagation inherent in these direct and indirect measures of defence and restriction have caused them to multiply *ad infinitum*, and it is no longer possible to keep count of them. New ones are being invented daily in each country, and, although their curative value is more than doubtful, their general effect is only too certain. Accumulated, the individual action of States

—necessarily limited to defence, and inevitably counteracted by other States—only aggravate the situation. These measures are comprehensible, perhaps even inevitable from the national point of view, but, taken as a whole, they are disastrous.

The Committee observes that no one is still under the illusion that it is possible for a country to improve its economic situation simply by unilateral measures which it considers indispensable. Figures are there to show that even the defence of the balance of payments, which is the legitimate concern of each country, is only achieved in a small measure and at the cost of economic depression and of a lowering of the standard of living.

Imports can certainly be reduced by means of increased duties, surtaxes, prohibitions, quotas, restrictions on foreign exchange—even so there is a limit which must not be exceeded—but its reduction is inevitably accompanied by a contraction of exports. If, as has often been argued, goods which can no longer be exported were sold on the home market in place of those excluded, one would not be concerned with the progressive fall in purchasing power and the constant increase in unemployment.

The Committee points out that the present situation is in marked contrast with the position prior to the crisis which was characterised by the existence of a large number of commercial treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause. At present the conclusion of such treaties is becoming more and more rare. States are reluctant to regulate their commercial relations as a whole by means of treaties. To meet particularly critical situations, they are content to have recourse to all kinds of expedients, which enable them to resume their freedom of action at any moment. The majority of agreements tend to restrict rather than to increase reciprocal advantages, and some even tend to sanction, explicitly and in advance, the reciprocal right of the parties to harm each other. Certain of the most recent agreements are based on reciprocity, whereas, until lately, the principle of the most-favoured-nation clause was practically the basis of all commercial treaties. Even when advantageous treaties are

still in force, the guarantees contained become illusory as a result of unforeseen measures introduced to meet the crisis. What is the use of a consolidated duty if an exchange surtax is superimposed? What good is freedom of trade guaranteed by treaty, but actually abolished or reduced by prohibitions or quotas, and what becomes of all the guarantees in the best treaty if buyers cannot obtain the foreign exchange necessary to pay for their purchases? Finally, what remains of this equality of treatment the most-favoured-nation clause was designed to ensure? The effects of such a state of affairs in a world where, thanks to technical progress, distances are tending to disappear, cannot be over-estimated. These effects are still greater in a continent such as Europe, where a large number of highly developed countries exchange on an average nearly three-quarters of their trade with each other. Each is beginning to notice with uneasiness that arbitrary action and disorder in international economic relations are tending to take the place of the security which commercial treaties had to some extent restored after the war. There is no country which, while making restrictions which it considers inevitable, fails to realise that they are a makeshift, to be abandoned as soon as possible. Moreover, it is to be feared that this policy may act as an inducement to profiteers, who are always ready to take advantage of exceptional situations. The parties concerned besiege the authorities with their petitions, and too often succeed in obtaining, under pretext of national interest, unwarranted protection, from which they alone benefit.

Again emphasising the influence exercised on international trade by the disturbances which have taken place since July, 1931, in the monetary and financial situation, and which have since become more acute, the Economic Committee proclaims that a settlement of financial questions must intervene without delay, and that inter-state co-operation should be established in regard to monetary and financial questions.

In the Committee's view, the efficacy of such co-operation must be gauged by its effects on international trade. The restrictions imposed on dealings in foreign exchange constitute an obstacle which is all the more formidable in that they are subject to frequent variations, and that, on this account, the trader is faced with an unforeseen situation and deprived, even after the delivery of goods, of payments which he has a right to expect. They often lead to discrimination between different categories of commodities and, thus, between different countries. They cause a great deal of

harm by helping to vitiate and divert artificially from the natural currents of trade commodities which—in so far as they are not stopped by other obstacles—avoid markets which cannot pay, or which can only do so with depreciated currency, have a natural tendency to flow in vast quantities to the few countries still in a position to make their payments in full, and with a sound currency. The latter, afraid of being swamped and deprived of the benefits of their exports, in their turn take up a defensive attitude, are swept into the restrictive movement, and, notwithstanding the soundness of their own currency, feel the monetary disturbances of the other countries.

In this connection the Committee finds that it appears to be very difficult for any country to put an end, independently of other countries, to the inconvenience which the control of exchange transactions imposes upon trade. Obviously, certain States could only do so if the countries with which their principal trade is carried on decided upon a similar policy. For this reason the Economic Committee welcomes with particular satisfaction the ideas recently expressed in regard to international co-operation for the settlement of monetary problems by international agreement. Meanwhile, however, the Committee urges that existing commercial treaties should be maintained as far as possible. Some of the difficulties resulting from measures of restriction could, it considers, be avoided if before applying such measures the countries concerned would carefully weigh the consequences and take into account the repercussions they might have in respect of third countries. Whenever possible, preliminary consultations should take place.

The regrettable consequences of the quota system might be mitigated if the latter were applied in moderation and with due regard to the interests of other countries; its sole purpose should be to avoid an abnormal increase in imports. Commercial currents can always be modified and developed, and the charge can reasonably be laid against quotas that they are too rigid and arrest the expansion of trade. The Economic Committee considers that, although in some cases exceptional conditions may necessitate the application of the quota system, it should be a purely temporary expedient. Pending its disappearance it is, in any case, essential that it should be attenuated in every possible way.

Recalling the doctrine defined in its report of June 18th, 1929,* the Economic Committee

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. IX., No. 4, p. 158, and No. 6, p. 223.

unanimously expressed the opinion that, notwithstanding the infringements to which it is now subjected, the most-favoured-nation clause in customs matters must remain one of the essential principles of economic relations, and that its disappearance would lead to confusion and incalculable difficulties. None the less, the Committee recognised that, in the present exceptional circumstances, one way of saving the regime of the most-favoured-nation clause might be to agree to such exceptions as seem essential for the solution of particular difficulties. There must be no entering into academic controversies about these exceptions; if they seem necessary to the parties concerned they must be submitted to the assent of third parties in agreed and specific form. In that case they would have much more chance of obtaining the consent of third countries.

The Economic Committee expresses itself in favour of a concerted economic action. No country is, in its view, to-day in a position to divert the trend of economic evolution by its own unaided efforts. Only concerted action which for the moment is difficult to imagine, but to which the Committee urgently looks forward, can restore international trade to its full volume, and this only provided (and this is even truer now than in January, when the Committee said it for the first time) that international relations enter upon a more peaceful era, and that a lasting improvement be effected in the financial position and the currency system.

Of this concerted action, whose value was perhaps not fully realised by any country in more prosperous times (the untiring efforts of the League between 1927 and 1930 must not be forgotten), a few signs, uncertain and sporadic it is true, are already to be seen, offering some hope of a possible improvement in the near future.

Although as regards international political debts the suspension of payments has not been followed by final settlement—though everyone hopes that such a settlement will soon be reached and will serve the general interest—it is to be observed that in regard to private debts a series of arrangements is being made day by day through agreements between debtors and creditors.

In industries particularly interested in export trade, movements are coming into being which tend towards the conclusion of arrangements, and even custom agreements which facilitate trade in certain branches of production.

The Economic Committee concludes with a statement to the effect that, in the present

grave situation, the worst possible thing would be to give way to despair and to the conviction that it is useless to oppose the march of events. It feels that a courageous policy openly directed towards international co-operation and co-ordination of effort is more necessary to-day than ever before.

2. *Present Conditions of International Trade.*

On this subject a note was prepared for the Economic Committee by the Section for Economic Relations.*

The note, in three parts, deals with (1) the present situation; (2) the set-back of international trade since 1928; (3) the collapse of international trade, and unemployment.

A brief introduction recalls that since July, 1931, very far-reaching changes have taken place in conditions of international trade. Up to that date international trade followed the lines indicated by a commercial policy which, though increasingly protectionist, was based on bilateral commercial agreements embodying the most-favoured-nation clause—and apart from traditional exceptions—on the free circulation of goods. Since that date international trade has been increasingly dominated by a combination of restrictive and discriminatory measures. These measures—introduced under the influence of financial and monetary factors by the financially depressed countries to prevent dealing in foreign exchange, and by other countries to prevent abnormal imports and to avert the contingency of the bankruptcy of the protectionist policy—were reinforced by the disturbances occasioned by the fact that a great number of countries found themselves obliged to abandon the gold standard.

It was pointed out that a distinction had to be drawn between measures arising out of the pursuit of a commercial policy conceived on the general lines of a protectionist national economic system and measures arising out of the present financial and monetary disorder. For the moment, the former seems to be relegated to the background, while the latter, whose existence impedes normal progress of trade, now occupies the foreground of public attention.

* * *

The first part of the note is a summary of the situation. The characteristic of the position is the effect upon international trade of the serious economic depression which has, since 1929, progressively extended to all countries,

* The principal chapters of this note have been reprinted as an annex to the Committee's report to the Council.

affecting in a greater or lesser degree all the branches of their productive activity and destroying confidence.

Not only have the values exchanged been considerably curtailed, but the volume of international trade has itself diminished. Far-reaching changes have taken place in the distribution of the various categories of exchanged products and in the composition of these categories. Generally speaking, trade currents have fallen off in intensity and have changed their character. The same groups of commodities are no longer being exchanged in the same relative proportion as before the crisis. In addition to the slackening in the internal economic activity of the different countries, this progressive change in the character of international trade has confronted governments with a problem of extreme complexity, for the terms of the problem are not fixed, but fluctuate continually.

Since 1930 practically every country has remoulded its custom tariff on a more or less extensive scale, or has increased its import duties on certain products to which protection appeared necessary. In the last few months, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Sweden, Brazil, Bolivia, Siam and the South African Union have increased their import duties on important categories of goods or even on the whole of their tariffs. The most striking development of all has been the adoption of a protectionist tariff by the United Kingdom.

Apart from the protection afforded by duties, a considerable number of countries have resorted to measures for the supervision and regulation of foreign trade. Since the second quarter of 1931, these measures have developed with an increasing rapidity *pari passu* with the deterioration of the financial position. According to the peculiar economical situation of each country, or the object in view, the measures taken were financial, monetary or commercial.

(a) *Financial measures.*—Under the burden of debt, and as a consequence of mass withdrawals of foreign capital, a number of debtor countries were compelled to take steps with a view to the supervision and restriction of dealings in foreign exchange. These measures, which aimed at preventing the flight of national capital to foreign countries, at maintaining the exchange rate of currency and, generally, at coping with the precarious financial situation, contributed more or less to accentuate, or even to provoke, the collapse of the import trade of the countries which had resorted to them. Further, they created inevitable discrimination

between the countries constituting the source of supply. Sometimes even they made the settlement of commercial debts impossible and necessitated difficult negotiations.

The European countries which up to now have resorted to measures for the control of foreign exchange dealings are Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Turkey and Yugoslavia.

(b) *Monetary measures.*—The abandonment of the gold standard by Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, Greece, Norway, Sweden, Australia, Canada, India and Japan led to a fall in the exchange value of these countries' currencies on the foreign market, thereby creating a disproportion between their internal and external purchasing power. This disproportion is in theory calculated to stimulate export trade, but under present circumstances has led to measures of retaliation on the part of certain countries, and has had the effect of restricting trade.

(c) *Commercial measures.*—The measures for the direct regulation of trade most frequently resorted to were the establishment of import quotas or import licences or permits. Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Estonia, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Turkey have already introduced such measures. But, while these measures are applicable in Germany, Belgium, Denmark, and Roumania, for example, only to certain groups of goods definitely specified as coming from particular countries, in other countries (France, Estonia, etc.) they have been continuously intensified, and actually extend in Latvia and Turkey to the whole volume of imports. Other countries again, such as Estonia and Persia, have preferred the system of an import monopoly; others have prohibited the importation of particular products (Spain, Portugal, Colombia); others have not restricted their measures to import trade but have adopted the export licence to specified wares (Denmark and Spain) or even for all wares (New Zealand).

To stem the combined effects of the crisis and measures for the regulation of international trade, various States concluded agreements for the exchange of specified products on a bartering basis (Germany and Hungary; Austria and Roumania; Bulgaria and Greece; Bulgaria and Switzerland; France and Latvia; Norway and the U.S.S.R.; Poland and Austria; Hungary and Bulgaria; Estonia and Yugoslavia).

Other countries resorted to compensation or

clearing agreements which, by avoiding direct payment for the goods exchanged, are designed to encourage the revival of commercial relations between the contracting parties. Austria concluded agreements with Germany, France, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Yugoslavia; Hungary with Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy and Switzerland; France with Estonia and Latvia; Switzerland with Yugoslavia.

* * *

The second part of the note (the international trade movement) gives figures indicating the setback of international trade since 1928, expressed in millions of dollars:

	<i>Imports.</i>	<i>Exports.</i>	<i>Difference.</i>
In 1928 ..	30,420	28,071	-2,349
In 1929 ..	31,198	28,487	-2,711
In 1930 ..	25,370	22,825	-2,545
In 1931 ..	18,258	16,221	-2,037

From 1929 to 1931 imports fell by 41.5 per cent., exports by 43.1 per cent. The decrease is, however, much larger if figures of the total trade for January and February in 1929 and 1932 are set side by side.

	<i>Imports.</i>		
	1929.	1932.	<i>Difference.</i>
January ..	2,740	1,101	-1,639
February ..	2,380	1,114	-1,266

	<i>Exports.</i>		
	1929.	1932.	<i>Difference.</i>
January ..	2,415	957	-1,458
February ..	2,206	1,006	-1,200

From January, therefore, the decrease is 59.8 per cent. on imports and 60.4 per cent. on exports; for February, 53.2 per cent. and 54.4 per cent. Up to January, 1930, the aggregate value of trade was more or less maintained; but from February the set-back began, gathering force in the second half of 1930 and throughout 1931.

From the beginning of 1930 to the beginning of 1932 foreign trade declined as follows:

		<i>Set-back percentage</i>	
<i>Country.</i>	<i>Imports.</i>	<i>Exports.</i>	
Germany ..	66	49	
Austria ..	37	54	
Belgium ..	50	40	
Spain ..	62	70	
France ..	51	51	
United Kingdom ..	39	47	
Hungary ..	59	70	
Italy ..	52	46	
Poland ..	63	58	
Roumania ..	61	42	

<i>Country.</i>	<i>Imports.</i>	<i>Set-back percentage Exports.</i>
Sweden ..	26	34
Switzerland ..	21	50
Czechoslovakia ..	48	61
Yugoslavia ..	59	65
Argentina ..	54	31
Brazil ..	44	21
Canada ..	60	49
U.S.A. ..	58	63
Japan ..	37	53
Union of S. Africa ..	47	48

These figures show the disastrous effect of the economic depression and the measures taken for the control of international trade. They relate, it is true, only to values and not to quantities, and thus show a larger falling-off than that resulting from the comparison of volume. But neither the values nor the quantities express the real extent of this phenomenon. While the favourable or adverse balance of the values of trade is an element of very great importance in the balance of payments, the quantities produced and exchanged are a no less important factor in the economic life of the different countries. Moreover, as the fall in prices affects differently the various countries and products, no estimate of the real significance of the trade decline is justified without qualitative examination of the foreign trade.

* * *

The third part of the note (collapse of international trade and unemployment) gives examples showing that the falling-off in trade has resulted in a corresponding falling-off in production, and therefore an increase in unemployment. The examples are drawn from Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and the United States, and bear upon one of the principal industries in each of these countries, such as chemical products, metallurgical industries, textiles, the cotton industry, the coal industry, the silk-weaving industry, the paper industry, the watchmaking industry, the glass industry, and the automobile industry.

* * *

The annex contains a summary by countries of measures introduced for the supervision and regulation of foreign trade.

3. *The International Position of Certain Branches of Production.*

(a) *Coal.*—The Economic Committee again devoted its attention to the peculiarly critical position of the coal industry. It noted that it did not seem possible to conclude at present

the agreement contemplated at the meeting of experts of January, 1932.* In these circumstances it wondered whether it would not be necessary to reconvene the Sub-Committee of experts on the coal industry, but as one of the principal coal-producing countries considered this inexpedient at the moment, it decided to postpone its decision.

(b) *Hops*.—The Economic Committee took note of the results of the meeting of the Committee of Experts on hops held last February.† These experts had expressed themselves in favour of the constitution of an international hop bureau which, in close contact with the International Institute of Agriculture, would study the problems connected with the production of hops and the hop trade. An already existing organisation—the Central European Hops Bureau—is to serve as a basis for the proposed organisation on genuinely international lines.

(c) *Timber*.‡—The Economic Committee also noted the results of the meeting of timber experts held last April.

The experts had contemplated the summoning of an international timber conference in which all the countries concerned would take part. The Committee took note of this intention.§ It decided to recommend Governments to neglect no action that might put an end to the unreasonable exploitation of timber capital which had taken place during the past ten years, the unfortunate results of which had been noted in many cases.

(d) *Motor vehicles*.||—The delegates instructed by the Economic Committee to hear experts on the motor industry proceeded on May 30th and 31st to a consultation, in the course of which it heard M. C. Schippert (Germany), M. P. Plasman (Belgium), M. Thomas Herain (Czechoslovakia), M. Alexis Duchon (France), Mr. B. H. Gladstone (Great Britain), M. G. Acutis (Italy), and M. M. R. de Nercy, Secretary-General of the Permanent International Bureau of Motor Manufacturers, Paris. These experts considered the difficult world situation of the motor vehicle production and trade, and means of remedying it. They examined a series of problems, the study of which will be gone into more thoroughly by the Permanent International Bureau of Motor Manufacturers, which has its seat in Paris, and of which all the experts consulted are members.

An American expert had been invited to the consultation but was unable to accept the invitation.

(b) *Customs Nomenclature*.*

The Sub-Committee of Experts on Customs Nomenclature held its final session at Berne from June 6th to 30th. It drafted the explanatory notes for several sections of its nomenclature, in particular those concerning textiles and transport material.

The Sub-Committee has, therefore, finished its work.

The draft nomenclature and the accompanying notes will be published immediately and forwarded to Governments for their observations.

(c) *Meeting of the Financial Committee*.

The Financial Committee met from June 27th to June 30th, 1932, under the presidency of M. Suvich (Italy). It considered the final report of its Gold Delegation,† and, generally speaking, declared itself in agreement with the constructive financial and economic proposals therein contained. It examined the financial situation of Hungary, with the assistance of its Budapest representative, M. Tyler, and that of Bulgaria, with the assistance of the League representative at Sofia, M. Watteau. It heard a statement of the financial situation in Greece submitted by M. Finlayson, Advisor to the Bank of Greece.‡

As regards Hungary, the Financial Committee drew the Council's attention to the fact that the Hungarian Government had not on June 15th effected the transfer of the sums necessary for the service of the 1924 Hungarian loan issued under the auspices of the League, and had decided that the yield of the assigned revenues should no longer be paid to the loan trustees; the Government would confine itself to placing to the credit of the trustees at the Hungarian National Bank a sum in pengoes representing the amount required for the loan service at the official exchange rate. These decisions constituted a default in respect of the obligations contracted towards the bondholders and the Council. During the first five months of the year Hungarian exports had not amounted to more than 56 per cent. of exports during the same months of the past year (33 per cent. of exports during the first five months of 1930), and less than 30 per cent. of the price of the exports paid in sound exchange. This considerable reduction in Hungary's transfer ability

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 7.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 2, p. 39.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 127.

§ This Conference has meanwhile been held in Vienna.

|| See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, p. 154.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 2, p. 39.

† See following chapter.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, pp. 124 and 125, and No. 5, p. 148.

explained the difficulties encountered by the Hungarian Government in the execution of its external engagements. While expressing its concern at the state of affairs existing in Hungary as regards external debts, the Committee declared that it saw no effective remedy to the constant decline of Hungarian trade apart from the general measures of financial and economic reconstruction to which it had already drawn attention.

As regards Bulgaria, the Committee drew the attention of the Government to the fact that the unilateral measures taken by that country with a view to the provisional suspension of 50 per cent. of the transfers for the service of the foreign public debt were not in accordance with the recommendations of the Financial Committee or with the decision of the Council, which expressly provided for the acceptance by the bondholders of the arrangements for the suspension of the transfers. The Committee exceptionally recommended certain measures with a view to alleviating the difficulties of the Treasury by the suspension of the amortisation of the State debt to the National Bank.

As regards Greece, the Committee noted that the Greek Government had been unable to effect the transfers necessary for its foreign loan service, and that it had reserved in its budget a sum in national currency corresponding only to half the sum due for interests to its foreign creditors when the drachme was at par.

The Austrian question having been referred by the Council to a meeting of a delegation of the Financial Committee and certain government representatives, which is still in session, the Committee was not called upon to devote special attention to the financial situation in Austria.

The Financial Committee was informed that the Roumanian Government had addressed to the Secretary-General a request for the League's technical assistance in the application of its programme of financial reform.

(d) *Report of the Gold Delegation.*

The final report of the Gold Delegation appointed by the League Financial Committee was published early in June.* The Delegation, which was appointed in 1929, had previously issued two interim reports and had published selections of the documents submitted by experts. The final report is signed by all the members who participated in the final discussions; but there are individual notes of dissent.

* * *

The first section of the report is concerned with the recent breakdown of the gold standard and the measures that should be taken to restore it.

The Delegation recommends a return to the gold standard with the definite statement that, at the present stage of world economic development, the gold standard remains the best available monetary mechanism. It is impressed by the practical difficulties and dangers of regulating currencies which are not on a common world basis, and by the very great desirability of agreement upon an internationally accepted standard to facilitate the free flow of world trade. Whatever theoretical advantages may be urged in favour of other monetary systems, their universal adoption, it states, presents very grave, if not insuperable practical difficulties at the present time. The Delegation considers, moreover, that granted the general acceptance of certain guiding principles, the gold standard is capable of functioning in such a way as to achieve most of the advantages of stability and justice claimed for alternative standards more broadly based on commodities other than gold.

Recognising that the time and level—as well as the particular form of restoration of the gold standard, should that be decided upon—can be determined only by the proper authorities in the countries concerned, the Delegation lays down certain conditions necessary before any such restoration can be expected.

There are three main recommendations involving international agreement and action. The first is the restoration of a reasonable degree of freedom in the movement of goods and services; the second, a satisfactory solution of the problem of reparation payments and war debts; and the third, agreement concerning certain guiding principles in respect of the working of the gold-standard system.

It is further considered essential that in each country the budgets of the State and other public bodies should be balanced on sound principles; and that the national economic system as a whole, and especially costs of production and of living, should be adjusted to the international economic and financial position, so as to enable the country to restore or to maintain the equilibrium of its balance of international payments.

* * *

The second section of the report deals with the working of the gold standard and the desirability of avoiding violent fluctuations in the purchasing power of gold. The analysis is introduced by a definition of purchasing power and

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 1, p. 35. and Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 11.

a discussion of the index-numbers available for its measurement. In succeeding chapters the supply of monetary gold is discussed in connection with the secular or long-term trend of prices.

The Delegation records its opinion that the world's total stock of monetary gold, apart from any considerations as to its distribution among different countries, has at all times in recent years been adequate to support the credit structure legitimately required by world trade, and that the rapid decline in prices, which began in 1929, cannot be attributed to any deficiency in the gold supply considered in this sense.

Statistics are given of the total supply of monetary gold, of the amount of new production, of the gold tempted from hoards in the Far East, and the amount of hoarding in Europe, which in the latter half of 1931 is estimated at \$400 million. Further statistics show the sharp accentuation of the problem created by the uneven distribution of central bank reserves, which is regarded as being caused by disequilibrium in the balance of payments of certain countries.

After considering the effects of violent fluctuations in the purchasing power of gold, the Delegation discusses the suggestion that action should be taken to raise the present price-level. It regards such a rise of prices as desirable, but does not look to monetary policy alone to adjust the price-level, which is influenced by many factors of a non-monetary character. Where credit contraction for one reason or another has been carried to extremes, it considers it proper and, indeed, imperative for the central bank to take such action as may be within its power to check excessive contraction, and in some cases to take the initiative in encouraging a freer use of credit. But it concludes that, until there is some clearing of the atmosphere of international distrust and a mitigation of the obstructions to international trade, it will be difficult to restore prices and standards of living to more satisfactory levels.

Concerning the possibilities of future price stabilisation, the Delegation expresses the view that it is not possible to avoid all oscillations in the general level of prices, and that such relative stability as it is possible and desirable to achieve cannot be secured by monetary policy alone. The maintenance of a flexible but relatively stable price-level can be achieved only by the most carefully planned and closest co-operation between central banks. The Delegation rejects the possibility of stabilisation policies based upon an index-number of whole-

sale commodity prices, but considers that action taken in international consultation and co-operation, and based upon a joint act of judgment in regard to all those indices which reflect business activity, might in fact have the result of keeping wholesale prices steady.

The most important recommendations are that the reserve ratios by which most central banks are now bound should be reduced, and that the Gold Exchange Standard system should be revived in a modified form.

In an annexed note, M. Albert Janssen, Chairman of the Delegation, Sir Reginald Mant and Sir Henry Strakosch dissent entirely from the analysis in the report of the causes leading to the abandonment of the gold standard. The dominant cause of the breakdown, in their view, is the maldistribution of monetary gold reserves which began in the early part of 1929.

In regard to future monetary policy, the dissenting members express the opinion that the primary objective of monetary policy should be stability in the general level of wholesale commodity prices. They differ from the majority in their much stronger belief that it is both theoretically and practically possible to restore gold prices to a suitable level and to maintain them stable at that level.

As regards practical remedies, the first two of those proposed in this note are practically identical with the recommendations of the report, namely, an early settlement of the question of war debts and reparations, and the removal, as far as possible, of restraints on international trade. There is, however, a divergence of views in the later recommendations. Whereas the report recommends national action to restore equilibrium of the price-levels and balances of payments, the dissenting note urges a concerted attempt by the principal gold-standard countries to restore wholesale commodity prices, as measured in gold, to the level prevailing in 1928, together with a similar attempt by the paper-standard countries, under the leadership of sterling, to stabilise their internal price-levels.

Professor Cassel, who was unable to attend the final meetings, wrote a separate note of dissent which, generally, is in agreement with that mentioned above. Short reservations were appended on special points by Professor M. J. Bonn, M. Guido Jung, and Mr. G. B. Roberts. The members who signed the report were: M. Albert Janssen (Chairman) (Belgium), Professor M. J. B. Bonn (Germany), Comte de Chalendar (France), M. Guido Jung (Italy), Sir Reginald Mant (India), Dr. Feliks Mlynarski (Poland), Dr. Vilem Popisil (Czechoslovakia),

Mr. George B. Roberts (United States), Sir Henry Strakosch (S. Africa), and Dr. I. J. A. Trip (Netherlands).

(e) *Meeting of the Delegation of the Financial Committee and of Government Experts.*

The delegation of the Financial Committee and of the Government experts appointed by the President of the Council to consider the problems raised in the general section of the Financial Committee's recent report,* as well as the appeal of the Austrian Government, met in Paris on May 30th, continuing work during June at Geneva and Lausanne. M. Musy (Switzerland) was elected to the Chair.

The meeting devoted special attention to the appeal of the Austrian Government, on whose behalf the Federal Chancellor, M. Dollfuss, the President of the National Bank, M. Kienböck, and M. Schuller, of the Foreign Ministry, took part in the proceedings. Several Governments having expressed their willingness to take part in the scheme of financial assistance for Austria, the meeting prepared a detailed protocol and annexes to this effect. As, however, the question is closely bound up with the matters under discussion at the Lausanne Conference, it is hardly probable that the meeting can finish its work before the end of that Conference.

2. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

Seventeenth Session of the Committee.

The Committee on Communications and Transit held its seventeenth session at Geneva from June 1st to 4th, 1932.

The rapporteur, M. Sylvian Dreyfus, paid a tribute to the memory of General Ferrie, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Radio-Electric Questions, of M. Pflug, member of the Permanent Road Traffic Committee, and of M. Romein, Assistant Secretary-General of the Transit Organisation, deceased during the year.

The Committee re-constituted its Bureau. It elected as Chairman M. de Ruelle (Belgium), and as Vice-Chairmen M. Dietrich von Sackenfels (Hungary) and M. Speluzzi (Argentina).

* * *

Passport formalities for Migrants, Officers, and Seamen.—At the request of the Director of the International Labour Office, the Committee, in 1931, instructed the Secretariat to make a study of the formalities required by States for the admission of migrants.†

As several Governments, in particular those of the immigration countries, had not yet replied to the questionnaire of the Secretariat, the Commission instructed the latter to complete its report in the light of replies that might yet arrive.

As regards passport formalities for officers and seamen in maritime navigation and for inland navigation personnel, the Committee noted the report of the Secretariat on the existing situation.

It referred all points concerning seamen to the Permanent Committee on Ports and Maritime Navigation. At present the laws on this subject differ considerably. In certain countries the landing of officers and seamen of the merchant marine is governed by no formalities whatever; in others it is subject to general rules such as the passport régime, the supervision of foreigners, etc., to special laws and regulations applicable to foreigners, or to various regulations for officers and seamen. To facilitate the landing of their nationals, certain States have concluded bilateral agreements; others have established a special and reciprocal régime in favour of nationals of other countries.

As regards inland navigation, the Commission noted that agreements had been concluded between various States belonging to important international river systems of Europe; on the Danube a special system, based on reciprocity, was applied, and a general régime was in operation in the territory of other States. It expressed the view that the situation was almost satisfactory.

Results of the Fourth General Transit Conference.—The Committee noted the results of the Fourth General Transit Conference (Geneva, October 12th to 24th, 1931).‡ In this connection it considered the question of negotiable documents for the international transport of goods by rail.§ This matter had been studied by the League in co-operation with the International Chamber of Commerce and the International Railway Union. The Council had instructed the Secretary-General to draw the attention of Governments to the importance of the problem, and to ask them to make the necessary arrangements to enable the next Conference for the revision of the Berne Convention on goods transport by rail to arrive at a solution which would give satisfaction to business circles. The Committee expressed the hope that Governments would favourably receive the communication of the Secretary-General.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 124, and No. 5, p. 148.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 6, p. 162.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, p. 296.

§ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 11, p. 313.

The Committee noted a resolution of the Conference inviting it to study, in agreement with the Governments concerned, measures calculated to remove barriers to maritime navigation. It decided to appoint a Sub-Committee.*

The Committee, further, noted various resolutions adopted by the Conference regarding arrangements to be made in the event of a serious interruption of transit routes, the economic and social aspects of fixing moveable feasts, the economic and social aspects of the simplification of the Gregorian calendar.

Air Transport Co-operation ; Relations between the Transit Organisation and the World Postal Union.†—The Committee took note of the steps taken by the Council with a view to the establishment, in the sphere of air transport, of methods of co-operation between the Universal Postal Union and the Transit Organisation similar to those existing for other methods of transport between the Transit Organisation and the competent international unions.

Request from the Zellweg-Wolfsberg and Unterdrauburg-Wöllan Railway Company.—A petition from the above Company, under Article 320 of the Treaty of St. Germain en Laye, having been addressed to the Council, the latter requested the Transit Committee to give a preliminary opinion.

After referring the question to a Committee of Experts, the Transit Committee expressed the view that, before appointing arbitrators, it would be necessary to give the parties—the Yugoslav Government and the Company—a further period of six months for the taking over of the railway sector situated in Yugoslav territory, on which principle the parties seemed in agreement.

The Committee reserved the question of the application of Article 320, considering that it was for the arbitrators who might eventually be appointed by the Council to examine both the question of law and that of fact.

Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube.—After the Permanent Court had given its advisory opinion of December 8th, 1927,‡ a Special Committee on the jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube was appointed to endeavour, with the co-operation of the delegates of the four States represented on the European Commission of the Danube, to reach agreement on new regulations

regarding jurisdiction over navigation on the lower Danube.

After negotiations, which lasted until 1929, the text of a convention was prepared and initialed. To enable the four States to conclude the new Convention, the parties to the Convention of 1921, establishing the final Statute of the Danube, signed a Declaration on December 5th, 1930.

The final conclusion and application of the Convention were reserved pending the establishment of rules for the organisation of tribunals and of a Court of Navigation, as well as the delimitation of the respective competence of these bodies.

This was the position when, in March, 1932, at a meeting of the Special Committee, the four delegates to the European Commission intimated that, in view of the existing economic position and, in particular, the financial situation of the European Commission and of Roumania, the modification of the judicial organisation did not seem desirable. They added that the putting into force of the new Convention was all the less necessary as they were on the point of adopting a *modus vivendi* which would provide a temporary solution for the difficulty which had caused the appeal to the League's good offices.

The Transit Committee asked the Secretary-General to inform the Governments of Powers parties to the Convention of the conclusion of the *modus vivendi* as soon as he had been notified to this effect, and, at the same time, to inform them that the four Governments no longer contemplated the conclusion of a new convention.

Unification of Transport Statistics.—The Committee noted the final report of the Committee for the Unification of Transport Statistics, which includes a draft Convention to serve as a preparatory document for a future international conference. The Committee asked the Secretary-General to forward this document to Governments, asking them to notify it of any proposals they might desire to make in regard to methods for the application of the principles contained in the Convention.

Other Questions.—Among the other questions dealt with by the Committee must be mentioned the League Wireless Station; § buoyage and lighting of coasts; the penal consequences of collisions at sea; the work of the second session of the Air Transport Co-operation Committee; the conveyance in transit of electric power, the transport of agricultural produce, etc.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 10, p. 296.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, p. 12.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. VII., No. 12, p. 347; Vol. VIII., No. 3, p. 97; and Vol. IX., No. 3, p. 81.

§ See special note under "Other Questions."

The Committee is composed as follows: M. de Agüero y Bethancourt (Cuba), M. de Dietrich von Sachsenfels (Hungary), M. Sylvain Dreyfus (France), M. Herold (Switzerland), M. Hoskier (Denmark), M. Ito (Japan), M. Krahe Herrero (Spain), M. Krbec (Czechoslovakia), M. Moderow (Poland), M. Nordberg (Finland), M. Rossi (Uruguay), M. de Ruelle

(Belgium), M. A. Seeliger (Germany), M. Sinigaglia (Italy), M. Speluzzi (Argentina), M. de Vasconcellos (Portugal), M. Y. Woo (China), and Sir John Baldwin (Great Britain).

During this session M. Hoskier (Denmark) was replaced by M. Jensen, and M. Ito (Japan) by M. Kobayashi.

V.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

I. CONFERENCE OF INSTITUTES FOR THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

The fifth annual session of the Conference of Institutes for the Scientific Study of International Relations was held at Milan from May 23rd to 27th, under the presidency of M. Rosso, Chairman of the Italian National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Some sixty delegates, representing numerous educational institutes concerned with important political and legal problems of contemporary international life, took part in the work. The Institute of Intellectual Co-operation was represented by its Director, M. Henri Bonnet.

At its preceding meeting, in view of the fact that the system of co-operation it had instituted for the exchange of information, documentation, lecturers, etc., had become sufficiently established during the past few years, the Conference had decided in future to devote an important part of its sessions to the examination of certain specific problems in the field of international relations.* For its Milan meeting it had selected the following subject: The study of economic life from the point of view of international economic and political relations.

The Conference specified that its object was, not to define a policy but, by a thorough discussion, to amplify the conclusions already reached by each of the institutes represented. These comparisons are designed to achieve a certain unanimity of opinion between the different schools, at least on certain important points, and a more thorough apprehension of the more controversial questions.

2. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.

In accordance with a decision of the Executive Committee of Intellectual Co-operation, the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation summoned in Paris for June 4th a meeting of representatives of Institutes dealing with intellectual property.

The meeting was presided over by M. Jules Destrée, Vice-Chairman of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

The work of the meeting concerned various problems in connection with intellectual property, such as copyright in mechanical performances; executants' rights; authors' rights in successive sales and the rights of their heirs when their works are sold publicly; the harmonisation of the Berne and Havana Conventions; scientists' rights; the legal state of international associations.

The Committee noted that satisfactory results had already been obtained owing to the permanent collaboration of the Institutes represented.

The following questions were reserved for further study: protection of historical, artistic, and scientific monuments, journalistic, and cinematographic copyright.

3. MEETING OF LIBRARY EXPERTS.

The Committee of Library Experts of the International Commission of Intellectual Co-operation held its sixth session at the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation on June 16th and 17th, under the presidency of Dr. Krüss, Director of the Prussian State Library.

The experts discussed at length the results of the inquiry undertaken by the Institute, at the request of the International Labour Office, into the use of popular libraries for workmen's recreation.† Considering that this inquiry might be of great assistance to national or international librarians' organisations, the experts recommended that the results should be published.

The Committee took note of the report on the organisation of documentation. Recognising the importance of co-ordination in this field, it expressed the view that relations between the centres of documentation in the various countries should be encouraged. It asked the Institute to prepare a memorandum for

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 6, p. 163.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 6, p. 164.

submission to the organisations already constituted, with a view to the establishment of a programme of study which would enable the problem to be dealt with within the framework of intellectual co-operation.

In view of the fundamental role of libraries in intellectual work, and the serious danger that a decrease in their resources would present for civilisation, the Committee asked the governments to maintain intact the very modest credits at the disposal of these institutions.

VI.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

After the conclusion of the Sino-Japanese Military Agreement of May 5th, Japan withdrew the military forces despatched to Shanghai. The withdrawal was terminated by May 31st.*

On June 13th the Municipal Council of the International Settlement at Shanghai reported a state of siege; on the 17th the Japanese authorities handed over to the Chinese authorities the parts of the zone assigned to the Japanese forces in the joint plan of defence, situated to the east of the Wou-Song railway line and outside the routes of the Extension.

On June 14th the Commission of Inquiry, presided over by Lord Lytton, cabled from Peking that, after visiting Manchuria, it had returned to Peking to study and co-ordinate its information, as well as to complete it on certain points. The Commission intended to return afterwards to Japan for a further exchange of views with the Japanese Government. It would begin the discussion of its final report during its stay in Japan, and would terminate and adopt it on its return to China. It hoped to be able to present this report at Geneva towards the middle of September at the latest.

The Commission left Peking for Japan via Korea on June 28th.

On June 23rd the Chinese Government, in view of the serious situation resulting from the adoption by the Japanese Diet of a resolution for the recognition of the "Manchukuo" Government, asked the Special Committee of the Assembly to invite the Japanese Government, in accordance with the resolutions of September 30th and December 10th, 1931, to "refrain from taking initiatives, which would further aggravate the situation, and to desist from such recognition, which was sure to render work of the Commission of Inquiry

The experts expressed the desire that League publications should be more widely distributed in libraries.

Among the questions on the agenda of the next meeting are the training of librarians, the publication of lists of cheap books for popular libraries, etc.

The meeting was attended by Mr. W. Bishop, M. A. Boselli, M. J. Cain, M. J. Collijn, M. A. Esdaile, M. M. Godet, M. J. Muszkowski and M. T. P. Sevensma.

abortive, and prepare the way for grave conflict in the Far East."

On June 24th the Special Committee, meeting under the presidency of M. Paul Hymans, addressed to the Chinese and Japanese representatives the following letter:

"The last communication from the Commission of Inquiry concludes with the words, 'The Commission hopes to submit its report to Geneva by about the middle of September at the latest.'

"As the report of the Commission of Inquiry is bound to constitute one of the essential elements of the documentation which the Assembly has requested the Council to transmit to it, together with any observations it may have to make, I think it should be arranged that the Council and Members of the League to whom this report will be communicated should be given time to study it carefully, which would be impossible if the period of six months provided for in Article 12 of the Covenant were strictly observed in the present case.†

"After consulting the Members of the Assembly who are sitting on its Special Committee, I have the honour to place before you the following proposal which, if it meets without your agreement and that of the Japanese/Chinese representative, might be submitted to the Assembly, which I shall summon in plenary meeting at an early date:

"While laying stress on the exceptional character of a measure which is imposed on it by circumstances, the Assembly, noting that the representatives of the Chinese and Japanese Governments have both informed its President of their agreement concerning the extension of the time-limit laid down in the second paragraph of Article 12 of the Covenant, decides to prolong this time-limit to the extent that may be strictly necessary and on the understanding that the said extension shall not constitute a precedent.

† Article 15 (final paragraph) of the Covenant stipulates that "in any case referred to the Assembly all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly," and Article 12 (second paragraph) stipulates that "the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute." The Council resolution referring the matter to the Assembly being dated Feb. 19th, the report should be established before August 19th.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, p. 163.

"After receiving the report of the Commission of Inquiry, the Assembly, on the proposal of its Committee, will fix the duration of the extension.

"It goes without saying that in deciding upon this extension the Assembly has no intention of unduly prolonging its work; it desires to conclude it as rapidly as circumstances permit. It hopes in particular that its Committee will be in a position to begin its examination of the report of the Commission of Inquiry before November 1st."

"In submitting to you this proposal, it is my duty to add that I have every confidence that the undertaking not to aggravate the situation entered into by the two Parties before the Council, and recorded by the latter on September 30th and December 10th, in resolutions which retain their full executive force, will be scrupulously observed. I am sure that you will agree with me that these resolutions will continue to be fully valid during the period for which the time-limit of six months may be extended. I would also refer you to the resolution which the Assembly adopted on March 11th, and in which it recalled the two resolutions of the Council.

"If the proposal which I have the honour to submit to you meets, as I hope it may, with your agreement, I should be grateful if you would inform me as soon as possible, in order that I may summon a plenary meeting of the Assembly."

On June 25th the Japanese representative intimated that he had no objection to prolonging the time limit fixed by Article 12 of the Covenant, while maintaining his earlier reservations.

The Chinese Government replied on June 26th that it would agree to the prolongation mentioned in M. Hymans' letter and in the statements contained therein, provided the time-limit of six months was not extended for longer than was demanded by circumstances. It expressed the hope that by November 1st the final report of the Assembly would be adopted or ready for adoption. The Chinese Government added that, since the Council resolutions of 1931 and the Assembly resolution of March 11th, Japan had constantly aggravated the situation

by extending the zone of military occupation and the hostilities, and by supporting a puppet government in Manchuria; the Chinese Government, accordingly, understood that the Assembly, by adopting the proposal of its Special Committee, would not admit of a further *aggravation of the situation during the extension of the time-limit.*

The Assembly met on July 1st and adopted the proposal of the Special Committee.*

2. REQUEST OF THE LIBERIAN GOVERNMENT.

To give effect to the Council Resolution of May 20th,† Dr. M. D. Mackenzie, of the League Health Organisation, left for Liberia on June 15th. Dr. Mackenzie was one of the experts previously sent to Liberia to study problems raised by the Liberian Government's request for assistance.

3. FRONTIER BETWEEN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

The Commission appointed by the Council, at the request of the British and French Governments, to study on the spot the question of the frontier between Syria and Iraq, met at Geneva at the beginning of June to prepare its report.‡

This Commission was composed of Colonel Iselen (Swiss) (Chairman); M. Pedro Marrades Gomez (Spanish), Commercial Attaché to the Spanish Embassy in Berlin, formerly Consul at Damascus, Jerusalem, Beyrout and Cett; and M. Carl Petersen (Swedish), Director of the Section of the Secretariat of the International League of Red Cross Societies, and assisted by four national assessors, British and French. It was called upon to gather on the spot all relevant information, and to make suggestions with a view to assisting the Council in its task of tracing the frontier between Iraq and Syria in such a manner as to constitute an acceptable and final solution for both parties.

VII.—OTHER QUESTIONS.

1. THE LEAGUE LIBRARY.

The Library Planning Committee, appointed to advise on the organisation and development of the international research library, for the construction and endowment of which Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., made the League a gift of two million dollars, held its fourth session in Geneva from June 6th to 8th.

The Committee made a careful study on the spot of the progress made in the construction of the building, the whole general framework of which is now in place. It expressed satisfaction at the design and arrangement, which

seemed to it to assure efficient administration, and made various suggestions with a view to the comfort of the readers.

The Committee also considered plans for the administration and development of the Library, which will be an important link in the chain of institutions interested in international affairs and will have an original capacity of one million

* An account of this meeting will be published in the July number.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, p. 16

‡ See Monthly Summary, 1931, Vol. XI., No. 12, p. 333.

books. As Geneva is more and more developing into a centre of research on international questions, a recommendation was made for a permanent advisory committee to meet once a year to advise as to the best use of Mr. Rockefeller's donation, and to correlate the Library with other big institutions.

The meeting was attended by Dr. William Warner Bishop (Librarian of the University of Michigan), Dr. Hugh Andres Krüss (Director of the Prussian State Library), and Sir Rennell Rodd, C.B., G.C.M.G., the last-named presiding in the absence of M. Scialoja.

2. THE LEAGUE WIRELESS STATION.

According to the contract with the builders and technicians the League Wireless Station was to have come into operation on December 1st, 1931. It was not possible to keep to this

time-limit, and the station only began to operate on February 2nd, 1932, the opening date of the Disarmament Conference. For this reason the League wireless expert was unable to make the necessary tests until May.

The Advisory Committee on Wireless Technical Questions, instructed to supervise the building of the Prangins and Colovrex stations, met at Geneva from June 27th to 28th. After noting the results obtained and proceeding to the necessary experiments it expressed the view that its findings were identical with those of the League expert, and that the apparatus furnished was in entire accordance with the estimates and the contracts.

This station communicates with China, Japan, and North and South America. The direct service with Japan is at present one of the best connections between Europe and the Far East.

VIII.—BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

I. ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL PUBLICATIONS.

(a) *Review of World Production, 1925-1931.**

This volume is a continuation of the *Memo-randum on Production and Trade*, published year by year from 1926 to 1931. It describes the changes in the world output of raw materials and foodstuffs, in the industrial activity of the principal industrial countries and in the activity of certain important industries, and, finally, relative movements in prices.

This statistical material covers the years 1925 to 1931; in certain cases, however, the material covers the period up to the end of the first quarter of 1932.

(b) *World Economic Survey, 1931-32.†*

This publication, prepared by the Economic Intelligence Service of the League, deals mainly with the economic events of the last three years.

A brief description of the origin and course of the depression precedes an analysis of the different aspects of economic life. Starting with the production of commodities, the Survey discusses the fall in prices, the shrinkage of international trade, difficulties in balancing international accounts, changes in banking structure and policy, wages and unemployment, public finance, commercial policy, etc. A final chapter surveys proposals for the alleviation of the crisis.

(c) *The Timber Problem.*

Under the title "The Timber Problem: its International Aspects," the League Secretariat has published a pamphlet containing the report of the Delegation instructed by the Economic Committee to consult experts on timber.‡

An annex to the report sets forth information on the position of the timber trade and industry furnished by Austrian, Canadian, Czechoslovak, Estonian, French, German, Italian, Latvian, Polish, Roumanian, Soviet, Swedish, Swiss and Yugoslav experts, as well as statistical data on the timber export during the past few years.

2. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN.

(a) *Elimination of Age Limit.§*

The 1921 Convention for the suppression of traffic in women and children provides for the punishment of traffic, notwithstanding the consent of the victims if they are under 21 years of age. The Traffic in Women and Children Committee has suggested the abolition of this age-limit. The present document is a comparative study of the laws and regulations in force in those countries which already punish trafficking in women who are of age and who consent. It gives the views of thirty-one Governments in regard to this question.

* One volume: 130 pages. 4 Swiss francs.

† One volume: 300 pages. 7.50 Swiss francs.

‡ See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 127.
§ Price: Swiss francs 0.50.

(b) *Central Authorities.**

This document deals with the practical work and organisation of the Central Authorities

constituted under the 1904 International Agreement on Traffic in Women and Children to collect information in regard to this question and to centralise action relative to it.

IX.—FORTHCOMING MEETINGS.

July 15th.—Second Session of the Committee of Experts on Customs Matters to assist the High Commissioner at Danzig, Danzig.

July 15th.—Executive and Directors' Committee of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Geneva.

July 18th.—Fourteenth plenary session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and ninth session of the Governing Body of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

July 30th.—Permanent Commission on Standardisation of Sera, Serological Reactions, and Biological Products, London.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

August 22nd.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

September 2nd.—Sixty-eighth session of the Council, Geneva.

September 5th.—Thirteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly, Geneva.

September 30th.—Reporting Committee for the Health of the Child of School Age and of the Adolescent, Geneva.

October 10th.—Health Committee, Geneva.

October 10th.—Economic Committee, Geneva.

October 17th.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

* 1 Swiss franc.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. FREE ZONES OF UPPER SAVOY AND THE DISTRICT OF GEX.

On June 7th the Court delivered its final Judgment in the case concerning the Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex. This case had been in dispute between France and Switzerland since 1919; it had been before the Court since 1928, and had already been the subject of two preparatory decisions in the form of Orders, delivered on August 19th, 1929, and on December 6th, 1930.

In its Judgment the Court decides, briefly, that these Free Zones—which, after being created in 1815 and 1816, had been abolished in 1923 by the single-handed action of France—are to be maintained in existence. Accordingly the Court rules that France must withdraw her customs line, in conformity with the provisions of 1815–1816. This withdrawal has to be effected by January 1st, 1934; the Court adds, however, that the withdrawal of the customs line does not affect the right of the French Government to collect at the political frontier fiscal duties not possessing the character of customs duties. Furthermore, the Court declares that, as the Free Zones are maintained, some provision for the importation of goods, free of duty, or at reduced rates, across the line of the Federal customs must be contemplated; for the rest, it leaves the manner of regulating such imports to the Government concerned, confining itself to placing on record a declaration made on behalf of the Swiss Government to the effect that the latter would agree, should France so desire, to the terms of these exchange of goods being settled by experts, failing an agreement between the parties.

* * *

The Judgment of the Court was adopted by six votes against five. M. Altamira and Sir Cecil Hurst subjoined a dissenting opinion on certain points regarding the interpretation of the Special Agreement; and M. Negulesco a dissenting opinion regarding the Court's jurisdiction. M. Yovanovitch confined himself to a statement of his dissent, while M. Eugène Dreyfus appended a dissenting opinion.

* * *

In the grounds of its Judgment, the Court begins by retracing the course of the protracted proceedings to which the case has given rise,

* This chapter has been compiled on the basis of material furnished by the Registry of the Court.

from the time when the Special Arbitration Agreement, signed by the parties in 1924, was submitted to the Court in 1928. These proceedings did not entirely take place before the Court, but on two occasions (August, 1929—April, 1930; December, 1930—July, 1931) took the form of direct negotiations between the parties.

Next, by reference to the instruments which created them, the Court gives a legal definition of the Free Zones to which the case relates, namely, the Gex Zone, the "little" Sardinian Zone, the St. Gingolph Zone, and the "Lake" Zone. In addition to the Treaties of Peace of Paris of May 30th, 1814, and the Final Act of the Vienna Congress of June 9th, 1815, these instruments included *inter alia* certain declarations made on March 20th and 29th, 1815, and on November 3rd and 20th, 1815, by the Powers assembled at Vienna, and the "Acts of Accession" of the Swiss Diet dated May 17th and August 12th, 1815, as also the Treaties of Paris of November 20th, 1815, and Turin of March 16th, 1816.

Continuing, the Court recounts the various changes which the customs régime has undergone in the districts in question, particularly on the occasion of the consolidation of the Swiss customs in 1849—since when the trade between the Zones and the adjacent Swiss territories has been regulated by treaty—and also during the war, 1914–1918, and, finally, goes on to relate the origin of Article 435 of the Treaty of Versailles and of the Special Agreement of October 30th, 1924, in virtue of which the case was submitted to it.

* * *

By the terms of this Special Agreement the first task of the Court is to say whether "between France and Switzerland" the above-mentioned Article 435 "with its Annexes" "has abrogated or is intended to lead to the abrogation of" the provisions of 1815 relating to the Free Zones: the Annexes in question are a Swiss Note of May 5th, and a French Note of May 18th, 1919.

To this dual question the Court replies in the negative; nor does it omit to observe, in so doing, that it is not in the position of being offered two propositions, one of which it is bound to accept: but that, on the contrary, the Court enjoys the freedom, which normally appertains to it, to reject both propositions

if neither of them corresponds to the opinion at which it arrives.

As regards the question whether Article 435, with its Annexes, *has abrogated* the provisions in question, the Court observes, *inter alia*, that a reply in the affirmative to this question would be contrary both to the wording and to the general structure of the Article; it further points out that, in any case, the Article is not binding upon Switzerland, who is not a party to the Treaty of Versailles, except to the extent to which she accepted it, and that extent is determined by the Swiss Note of May 5th, 1919, which specifically excludes the acquiescence of Switzerland in the abolition of the Zones.

As regards the question whether Article 435, with its Annexes, *is intended to lead to the abrogation* of the provisions in question, the Court considers two lines of argument: the first, according to which Switzerland had consented to co-operate in an agreement involving the abolition of the Zones; and the second, according to which the consent of Switzerland to such an agreement was unnecessary, because she had no actual right to the Zones. In regard to the first supposition, the Court is unable to admit the existence of any such consent; in regard to the second, the Court points out, to begin with, that Switzerland's right to the Zones is presumed both in Article 435 itself and in the discussions which preceded it; it then proceeds to show—examining separately the cases of the Gex Zone, the little Sardinian Zone and the St. Gingolph Zone—that the former provisions give the Swiss rights in the Zones a really contractual character.

* * *

By the terms of the Special Agreement the Court is called upon, in the second place, to settle "all the questions involved by the execution of paragraph 2 of Article 435" referred to above; this settlement must, according to the Special Agreement, be effected in the same judgment as that in which the Court pronounces its decision on the above-mentioned question of interpretation.

In the view of the Court this settlement must take as its starting point the reply given by the Court to the question of interpretation. In arriving at this conclusion the Court takes its stand on the actual wording of the Special Agreement (which speaks of "a single judgment") and on the general structure of that instrument. The Special Agreement provided for the communication to the parties, during the procedure, of the result of the Court's

deliberation on the question of interpretation in order that this result might serve as a basis for a possible agreement between them; and in the opinion of the Court such an arrangement would not be comprehensible if, in the event of the failure of the negotiations, the Court was free to settle the régime of the Zones on a basis other than that which it had indicated to the parties in order to assist them in reaching an agreed solution.

Towards the end of the proceedings the French Government had introduced various new arguments; Switzerland entered an objection to their admission on the ground that they were submitted too late. The Court, however, held that it was preferable to admit them and to deal with them on their merits, because the decision of an international dispute of the present order should not mainly depend on a point of procedure.

The chief of the new arguments in question was based upon the clause "*rebus sic stantibus*": France submitted that, apart from the possible abrogation of the Zones as a result of Article 435 of the Treaty of Versailles, the former provisions relating to the Zones had lapsed owing to the conditions having undergone a change between 1815–1816 and the present day, this change having, it was contended, altered the special situation out of regard for which the Zones had been created. The Court holds, however, that this argument fails, owing to the lack of evidence that the Zones were created in consideration of circumstances which have since ceased to exist. The Court, therefore, thinks it unnecessary to consider any of the questions of principle which arise in connection with the clause *rebus sic stantibus*, or whether the clause might be applicable in the present case. To sum up, the new arguments submitted by the French Government do not prevent the Court from carrying out its task.

But if, in carrying out its mission, the Court should provide for a system of customs exemptions, this system could not, according to the Special Agreement, be established except with the consent of both the parties. The Court holds that if this consent had to be subsequent to the judgment, such a condition could not be reconciled with the Statute; but, in point of fact, one of the parties only had given its consent in advance. For this reason, the Court considered that there was a veritable limitation of its powers, and that, consequently, the judgment must be confined to questions of law, which were not affected by this condition. The Court holds, however, that the fact of its being unable, owing to the operation of the

Special Agreement, to carry out a part of its mission does not oblige it to declare itself competent in respect of the whole dispute.

On the other hand, the Court's jurisdiction is restricted, in other directions, by the respect which is due to the sovereignty of France over the Zones, a sovereignty which is complete in so far as it has not been limited by the former provisions relating to the Free Zones.

* * *

The settlement which the Court prescribes, having regard to the limitations indicated above, requires, in the first place, the withdrawal of the French customs line to the rear of the political frontier, where it had been placed in 1923 without the consent of Switzerland; on the other hand, the Court is unable to envisage a modification of the customs line, as traced by the former provisions, that question being outside its jurisdiction.

Furthermore, the Court recognises that, as the above-mentioned provisions only relate to the customs cordon, France remains free, in virtue of her sovereignty over the Zones, to establish at her political frontier a control cordon (*cordon de surveillance*), and to collect taxes, not possessing the character of customs duties, at that frontier, a reservation being naturally made as regards abuses of right; France must not evade the obligation to maintain the Zones by creating a customs barrier under the guise of a control cordon.

In this connection, the Court declares that if, by the maintenance in force of the old treaties, Switzerland obtains the economic advantages derived from the Free Zones, she ought, in return, to grant compensatory economic advantages to the inhabitants of the Zones; she has, indeed, announced her willingness to do so.

It is in view of these considerations, and also in view of the complex questions involved by the withdrawal of a customs line, that the Court has appointed January 1st, 1934, as the date by which the withdrawal must have been effected.

2. INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE OF MEMEL.

The French Government appointed as its assistant Agent M. Charguéraud, assistant legal adviser to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; the Italian Government appointed as Agent M. Massimo Pilotti, first President of a Court of Appeal, legal adviser to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; and the Lithuanian Government appointed as counsel M. Jacob Robinson, advocate of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania,

For this case all the ordinary judges of the Court were present on the Bench, namely: M. Adatci (President) (Japan), M. Guerrero (Vice-President) (Salvador), M. Kellogg (United States), Baron Rolin-Jaequemyns (Belgium), Count Rostworowski (Poland), M. Fromageot (France), M. de Bustamante (Cuba), M. Altamira (Spain), M. Anzilotti (Italy), M. Urrutia (Colombia), Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain), M. Schücking (Germany), M. Negulesco (Roumania), Jonkheer van Eysinga (Netherlands), M. Wang (China), and also M. Römeris, judge *ad hoc*, appointed by the Lithuanian Government. M. Guerrero, Vice-President of the Court, performed the duties of President; M. Adatci, the President of the Court, being a national of one of the countries parties to the case.

The hearings began on June 8th. At the opening sitting, M. Römeris, the judge *ad hoc* appointed by the Lithuanian Government, made the solemn declaration provided for by Article 20 of the Statute and Article 5 of the Rules, and was declared duly installed in his duties as judge *ad hoc* for the case.

(a) *The Merits.*

In the course of public sittings held on June 8th, 13th, 14th, 16th and 18th, the Court heard the oral arguments, reply and rejoinder, in regard to the first four questions mentioned in the application instituting proceedings,* presented by Sir William Malkin on behalf of the Government of Great Britain; by M. Charguéraud on behalf of the French Government; by M. Pilotti, on behalf of the Italian Government; by M. Matsunaga, on behalf of the Japanese Government; and by M. Sidzikauskas, on behalf of the Lithuanian Government.

The Court is now deliberating upon the four points referred to.

(b) *Question of Jurisdiction.*

On June 10th the British, French, Italian and Japanese Governments filed their observations on the preliminary objection raised by the Lithuanian Government in respect of the two last of the six points set out in the application instituting proceedings.

At public sittings held on June 14th and 15th, the Court heard the oral arguments upon the Lithuanian objection, presented by M. Sidzikauskas, on behalf of the Lithuanian

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, p. 141.

Government, and M. Charguéraud, on behalf of all the Applicant Powers.

After deliberation, the Court, on June 24th, delivered judgment on this objection, which it overruled by thirteen votes to three (Baron Rolin-Jaequemyns, Count Rostworowski and M. Römeris), and accordingly reserved points 5 and 6 of the Application for judgment on the merits.

The grounds for the Court's decision may be summarised as follows :

The jurisdictional clause under which the case was brought before the Court is Article 17 of the Convention of May 8th, 1924, concerning Memel. According to paragraph 1 of this Article any Member of the Council of the League is entitled to draw the attention of the Council to any infraction of the provisions of the Convention ; under the second paragraph the Principal Allied Powers, Members of the Council, may refer to the Court any difference of opinion between them and Lithuania in regard to questions of law or of fact concerning these provisions.

The Lithuanian preliminary objection was based on the view that any dispute, before being referred to the Court, must be submitted to the Council for examination, so that recourse could only be had to the Court after a failure of the procedure before the Council, and—the Lithuanian Government contended—points 5 and 6 of the Application had not been examined by the Council prior to their submission to the Court.

In regard to this, the Court observes that if proceedings before the Council are to be a condition precedent to proceedings before the Court, the intention of contracting parties to stipulate such a condition must be clearly established ; but this has not been done in the present case. Moreover, the procedures before the Council and before the Court provided for by Article 17 of the Memel Convention are, by reason of their objects, distinct, and they are distinct also with regard to those who may initiate them. Finally, the principle of the unity of the proceedings would prevent a case brought before the Council by a Government, other than that of one of the Principal Allied Powers, from being proceeded with before the Court, a result held to be inadmissible.

The Lithuanian Government, in support of its view, had adduced certain arguments drawn either from the wording of the relevant Article or from its history, or again from certain statements found in reports submitted at various times to the Council of the League.

The Court in the grounds of its judgment answers all these arguments and finally rejects them.

Having reserved points 5 and 6 for judgment on the merits, the Court, by an Order of the same date as the Judgment, has fixed July 9th, 1932, as the date of the expiration of the time allowed to the Lithuanian Government for the presentation of a written statement concerning these points.

3. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND.

The times allowed for the presentation of the reply of the Danish Government and the rejoinder of the Norwegian Government had been fixed to expire respectively on July 1st and September 1st, 1932, by an Order made by the Court on August 6th, 1931.*

At the request of the Danish Government, the time-limit fixed for the filing of the reply has been extended until July 22nd, 1932, by an Order of Court dated June 18th, 1932. At the same time, the Court fixed the time-limit for the presentation of the Norwegian Government's rejoinder at September 23rd, should that Government make no request for an extension of time ; at October 14th, should that Government make such a request.

The Norwegian Government's Agent, having subsequently made the anticipated request, the last date, namely, October 14th, automatically becomes operative.

These times have been fixed, subject to any other proposals which the Parties may submit to the Court, by common agreement, before July 1st.

Subject to this reservation, the case will be ready for hearing at the end of October.

4. DELIMITATION OF THE TERRITORIAL WATERS BETWEEN THE ISLAND OF CASTELLORIZO AND THE COASTS OF ANATOLIA.

The times for the written proceedings, originally fixed by an Order dated November 30th, 1931, had been extended by an Order made on March 8th, 1932. On receipt of a request from the Italian and Turkish Governments, the Court, by an Order made on June 23rd, has granted a further extension of the time-limits, which are now fixed as follows :

For the filing of Cases, January 3rd, 1933.

For the filing of Counter-Cases, April 1st, 1933.

For the filing of Replies, June 1st, 1933.

The case, therefore, will be ready for hearing in June of next year.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 8, p. 213.

5. INTERPRETATION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1919 CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN DURING THE NIGHT.

The British Government having asked for a hearing in the course of the oral proceedings in this case, the Court, under Article 73, No. 1,

para. 3, of its Rules, has informed this Government that this request will be granted.

6. COMMUNICATION OF TREATIES.

Since April 1st, 1932, the following treaties and agreements have been filed with the Registry :

Date of Filing.	Nature of Instrument.	Date of Signature.	Signatories.
April 2nd, 1932 ..	Convention of Commerce and Navigation.	Bucharest, 11.8.31	Greece and Roumania.
April 2nd, 1932 ..	Convention regarding conditions of residence and business.	Bucharest, 11.8.31	Greece and Roumania.
April 2nd, 1932 ..	Veterinary Convention	Bucharest, 11.8.31	Greece and Roumania.
June 17th, 1932 ..	Treaty of Conciliation, Arbitration, and Judicial Settlement.	Sofia, 26.11.31	Bulgaria and Norway.
June 17th, 1932 ..	Treaty of Conciliation, Arbitration, and Judicial Settlement.	Geneva, 12.2.32	Luxemburg and Norway.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

JUST OUT.

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 1931-32

viii+338 pages, 7 maps { Price : in wrappers .. 7s. 6d. \$2.00
Bound in cloth .. 10s. 0d. \$3.00

A special effort has been made, in collaboration with various statistical administrations, to make the Present Year-Book as up to date as possible. The majority of the tables cover the year 1931.

The number of subjects dealt with in this edition has been considerably increased. Among the principal new features will be found the League's world indices of output of raw products, tables on balances of international payments, on the world production of motor vehicles, on illiteracy, broadcasting, gold stocks, narcotic drugs, slaughtering, production of platinum and various other metals and minerals, and considerably expanded and quite up-to-date statistics of unemployment and employment by industries. The comprehensive demographic tables shown are this year of special interest, as they take account of the censuses held in 1930 and 1931.

Other tables relate to the output of agricultural products, ores, metals, various chemical products, electricity, etc.; industrial activity, international trade, shipping, railways, motor vehicles, public finance, note-circulation, reserves, bank-deposits, the capital market, exchange rates, prices, wages, unemployment, labour disputes, etc. Several maps, price-quotations for a considerable number of products, several tables of conversion coefficients for currencies, weights and measures and a detailed alphabetical index are also given.

MONTHLY BULLETIN OF STATISTICS (French and English texts)

Annual subscription rate (12 numbers of 44 pages each) :

18s. 0d. \$4.00 post free
Single number 1s. 6d. \$0.40

A synopsis of the economic position of all important countries in the world in a convenient and concise form; indispensable to all bankers, business-men and politicians who wish to keep abreast of world movements; showing coal, pig-iron and steel production; foreign trade; price movements, cost of living; unemployment; gold reserves and note circulation, exchange and discount rates, etc., according to official information specially supplied each month. Data apply to over 50 countries.

In this *Bulletin* a large number of the most important tables of the *Year-Book* are kept regularly up to date. It is published on the Thursday nearest the 15th of each month.

Complete catalogue and detailed prospectus sent free on application.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

JUST OUT

THE TIMBER PROBLEM

Its International Aspects

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. B. 6.)

51 pages

This report analyses the present crisis in the timber trade due to the great disequilibrium between production and consumption, and contains certain proposals with regard to international action.

Annexed to this document is the information supplied by the Experts concerning the position of the timber industry and trade in their respective countries, namely, Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Poland, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and Yugoslavia,

THE COAL PROBLEM

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. B. 4.)

55 pages

Gives the results of a consultation of a large number of coal experts summoned by the League of Nations in January, 1932.

IN PREPARATION.

REVIEW OF WORLD PRODUCTION, 1925 TO 1931

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 13.)

About 130 pages In the press

This volume is a continuation and expansion of the *Memorandum on Production and Trade* which was published annually from 1926 to 1931. It will contain chapters on world population, production of foodstuffs and raw materials, output of the manufacturing industries and prices. Special attention will be paid to the changes that have taken place since the outbreak of the depression, and much new material, especially regarding relative price movements and the relative charges in the production of different classes of goods, will be set forth and analysed.

WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY, 1931-32

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 18.)

About 300 pages To be published in August, 1932

It is intended in this Survey to present in popular form a description and an analysis of world economic developments, year by year. In the first edition considerable attention will be paid to the tendencies at work in the past decade, against the background of which recent phenomena can alone be studied in their true perspective. The Survey will also be essentially up to date: a considerable part of the material for the forthcoming edition will be brought up to the middle of 1932.

Complete catalogue sent free on application.

**LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT, GENEVA**

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly):

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 5s. \$1.25

4. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual).

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (*Trilingual*) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

9. I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual):

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

	<i>Paper bound</i>	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
	<i>Cloth bound</i>	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS:

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

Colour Vision Tests. 47 pp.	2s. 0d.	\$0.50
*Unemployment and Public Works. 186 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. xii + 263 pp.	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky. v + 212 pp.	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930. iv + 692 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building. xii + 378 pp.	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation. vii + 381 pp.	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene. vii + 183 pp.	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	8s. 0d.	\$2.00
	6s. 0d.	\$1.50

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
Volume edition (in two volumes) { <i>Paper bound</i>	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	£3 10s. 0d.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN Mr. M. R. K. BURGE, 12, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1. (Telegrams: Interlab, Sowest, London.) Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)	U.S.A. American Sales Agents: WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION, 40, Mount Vernon Street, Boston 9, Mass.	JAPAN Mr. J. ASARI, Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya Park, Kojimachiku, Tokio. (Telegrams: Kokusairodo, Tokio.) Telephone: Ginza 1580.)
INDIA Mr. P. P. PILLAI, International Labour Office (Indian Branch) New Delhi. (Telegrams: Interlab, New Delhi.)		

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

REPORT OF THE GOLD DELEGATION *of the FINANCIAL COMMITTEE*

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 12.)

83 pages Price : 2s. 6d. \$0.60

The first part of this new report is of an analytical nature and undertakes a *critical survey of the working of the gold standard since the war*. The fourth and fifth chapters of the first part, dealing respectively with the breakdown of the international monetary system and the restoration of the gold standard, embody more or less the main conclusions of the report. In view of the importance of all questions relating to the causes of the breakdown of, and the conditions of return to, the gold standard by these countries that have abandoned it, these two chapters, as well as the rest of the report, would be of great value and interest, not only to economists, but also to the general public.

The second part of the report undertakes a very thorough descriptive survey of all events, figures and facts relating to prices, gold reserves and their distribution, and the means by which gold can be economised in times of scarcity, and presents *the most up-to-date analysis of these problems*. This report is unanimous except for a few dissenting notes on particular problems touched in the report.

PUBLISHED PREVIOUSLY.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE GOLD DELEGATION OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1930. II. 26.)

120 pages Out of print

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE GOLD DELEGATION OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 2.)

22 pages Out of print

SELECTED DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE GOLD DELEGATION OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1930. II. 34.)

87 pages Out of print

SELECTED DOCUMENTS ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOLD SUBMITTED TO THE GOLD DELEGATION OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 7.)

67 pages, 2 inset diagrams and 2 inset tables Out of print

LEGISLATION ON GOLD

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1930. II. 29.)

375 pages Price : 12s. \$3.00

THE FUNCTIONING OF THE GOLD STANDARD

By Prof. F. MLYNARSKI

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 25.)

116 pages Price : 3s. 3d. \$0.80

Complete catalogue sent free of charge on application.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
GENEVA.

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 7.

JULY, 1932

Admission of Turkey to
the League.

Preparation of a World
Economic and Financial
Conference.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 7.

JULY, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, July, 1932</i>	207	VII. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments</i>	208	1. <i>Statements of the British and French Governments</i>	235
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		2. <i>Appeal from the Chinese Government</i>	235
1. <i>Admission of Turkey to the League</i>	224	VIII. <i>Budgetary and Financial Questions :</i>	
2. <i>Elections to the Council</i>	225	<i>The Supervisory Commission</i>	237
IV. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		IX. <i>League Publications :</i>	
1. <i>The Economic and Financial Organisation :</i>		<i>Balance of Payments 1930</i>	237
(a) <i>Preparation of a World Economic and Financial Conference</i>	226	X. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	238
(b) <i>The Financial Situation of Austria</i>	227		
(c) <i>Work of the Financial Committee</i>	229		
2. <i>The Health Organisation :</i>			
<i>The Opium Commission of the Health Organisation</i>	230		
V. <i>Intellectual Co-operation</i>	230		
VI. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>			
<i>Mandates</i>	234		
<i>Request of Iraq for Admission to the League</i>	234		

The Permanent Court of International Justice.

1. <i>Interpretation of the Statute of Memel</i>	239
2. <i>Prince of Pless Administration</i>	239
3. <i>Legal Status of certain parts of Eastern Greenland</i>	239
4. <i>Certain Judgments given by the Hungary-Czecho-Slovak Mixed Arbitral Tribunal</i>	239
5. <i>Legal Status of certain Territories in South-East Greenland</i>	239

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

July, 1932.

The principal League events in July were the termination of the first phase of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the admission of Turkey to the League, and a special meeting of the Council to consider the economic and financial situation.

The Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments closed the first part of its session on July 23rd with the adoption of a resolution recording the points in regard to

which agreement had been secured, making arrangements for its future work, and prolonging the Armaments Truce of September 29th, 1931.

The Special Assembly of the League of Nations devoted several meetings to the consideration of the Turkish request for admission to the League and, on July 18th, unanimously passed a resolution declaring Turkey a Member of the League.

The Council met on July 15th, when it considered a request from the Lausanne Conference concerning the convocation of an international economic and monetary conference, and the financial situation of Austria, Bulgaria and Hungary.

The Organisation for Intellectual Co-operation held its annual meeting from July 12th to 23rd. Its discussions bore upon the education of young people, school books, educational films and broadcasting, the education of adults, educational reform in China, scientific, literary and artistic questions, and the work of the

Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute in Rome.

Other questions dealt with during the month concerned the existing system of elections to the Council, budget and administrative questions, the prolongation of the time limit fixed in Article 12 of the Covenant in connection with the Sino-Japanese dispute, etc.

A communication was received from the British Government forwarding Iraq's formal request for admission to the League.

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The conversations which took place between certain delegations at the recommendation of the Bureau of the General Commission of the Conference continued during the first days of July.

On July 5th, the Bureau invited Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), in agreement with other delegations or groups of delegations, to prepare a resolution including the points in regard to which agreement had been reached by the Conference. On the 7th, the General Commission approved this decision. On July 7th and 8th, the General Commission heard the representatives of delegations which had not yet been able to express their views regarding President Hoover's proposals.

M. Dupré (Canada), M. Carton de Wiart (Belgium), M. de Macedo-Soares (Brazil), Kemal Hüsnü Bey (Turkey), M. de Agüero y Bethancourt (Cuba), M. Pflügl (Austria), M. Irgens (Norway), M. Deschamps (Dominican Republic),* M. Erich (Finland), M. de Masirevitch (Hungary), M. Schou (Denmark), M. Najera (Mexico), M. Lo (China), M. Sandler (Sweden), General Laidoner (Estonia), M. Motta (Switzerland), M. Antoniadé (Roumania), M. Ansari (Persia), M. Escalante (Venezuela), M. Bosch (Argentina), M. Rutgers (Netherlands), M. Lanskoronskis (Lithuania), M. Hussein Aziz Khan (Afghanistan), M. Restrepo (Colombia), M. Feldmans (Latvia), M. de Quevedo (Portugal), M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), M. Mikoff (Bulgaria), and M. Choumenkovitch (Yugoslavia), on behalf of their Governments, acceded in principle to the Hoover proposals.†

* On July 7th the Dominican Republic gave notice that its representatives who had, up to that date, been attending the meetings of the Conference as observers only, would take a direct part in its work.

† A statement made by the British Government on July 7th in the House of Commons concerning the Hoover proposals was communicated to the Conference.

On July 7th the General Commission decided that it would express itself later as to how and when the questions of principle raised in the Committee on Effectives should be settled.

The preparation of the draft resolution was terminated on July 20th. Sir John Simon, having to leave Geneva, handed to Dr. Benes, rapporteur to the General Commission, a text which he considered might provide, after the necessary negotiations, a basis for the preparation of a draft resolution.

After further conversations with delegations, Dr. Benes read to the General Commission on July 20th the following draft resolution, which was approved almost without any modifications.‡

I.

The Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments,

Profoundly convinced that the time has come when all nations of the world must adopt substantial and comprehensive measures of disarmament in order to consolidate the peace of the world, to hasten the resumption of economic activity, and to lighten the financial burdens which now weigh upon the peoples of the world;

Desirous of avoiding a competition in the power of armaments which would be both ruinous to the peoples and threatening to their national defence;

Recalling its resolutions of April 19th, 20th and 22nd, 1932;

Firmly determined to achieve a first decisive step involving a substantial reduction of armaments, on the basis of Article 8 of the Covenant

‡ The text given is that of the resolution as voted. The few amendments made in the course of the general discussion were, generally speaking, purely formal.

In paragraph 3 of part 3, however (trade and manufacture of arms) the Commission decided, on a proposal presented by M. de Madariaga on behalf of the Belgian, Czechoslovak, Danish, Estonian, Finnish, Mexican, Polish, Roumanian, Spanish, Swedish, Swiss, and Yugoslav delegations that the special committee instructed to make proposals with regard to the regulation of the trade in and private manufacture of arms and war material should also concern itself with state manufacture.

of the League of Nations, and as a natural consequence of the obligations resulting from the Briand-Kellogg Pact ;

Welcoming heartily the initiative taken by the President of the United States of America in formulating concrete proposals for a substantial reduction of armaments by the prohibition of certain methods of warfare, by the abolition of certain material, and by reductions varying in magnitude and amounting for certain armaments to the proportion of one-third ;

Bearing in mind also the draft Convention of the Preparatory Commission, the statements and proposals made to the Conference by a number of delegations, and the reports and resolutions of the various Commissions of the Conference :

Decides forthwith and unanimously, guided by the general principles underlying President Hoover's declaration :

1. That a substantial reduction of world armaments shall be effected to be applied by a general Convention alike to land, naval and air armaments ;
2. That a primary objective shall be to reduce the means of attack.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THE CONFERENCE.

The Conference, noting that agreement has now been reached on a certain number of important points, decides, without prejudice to more far-reaching agreements hereafter, to record forthwith the following concrete measures of disarmament, which should form part of the general Convention to be concluded. The Conference also decides to establish certain principles as the basis for further reductions of armaments, and to determine the procedure necessary for the active prosecution of its work.

1. AIR FORCES.

The Conference, deeply impressed with the danger overhanging civilisation from bombardment from the air in the event of future conflict, and determined to take all practicable measures to provide against this danger, records at this stage of its work the following conclusions :

1. Air attack against the civilian population shall be absolutely prohibited ;
2. The High Contracting Parties shall agree as between themselves that all bombardment from the air shall be abolished, subject to agreement with regard to measures to be adopted for the purpose of rendering effective the observance of this rule.

These measures should include the following :

(a) There shall be effected a limitation by number and a restriction by characteristics of military aircraft ;

(b) Civil aircraft shall be submitted to regulation and full publicity. Further, civil aircraft not conforming to the specified limitations shall be subjected to an international régime (except for certain regions where such a régime is not suitable) such as to prevent effectively the misuse of such civil aircraft.

2. LAND ARMAMENTS.

(a) *Land Artillery.*

1. All heavy land artillery of calibres between any maximum limit as determined in the succeeding paragraph and a lower limit to be defined shall be limited in number.

2. The limitation of calibre of land artillery shall be fixed by the Convention.

Subject to an effective method being established to prevent the rapid transformation of guns on fixed mountings into mobile guns, different maxima for the calibre of land guns may be fixed as follows :

(a) A maximum limit for the calibre of coastal guns, which shall not be less than the maximum calibre of naval guns ;

(b) A maximum limit for the calibre of guns in permanent frontier or fortress defensive systems ;

(c) A maximum limit for the calibre of mobile land guns (other than guns employed for coastal defence).

(b) *Tanks.*

The maximum unit tonnage of tanks shall be limited.

3. CHEMICAL, BACTERIOLOGICAL AND INCENDIARY WARFARE.

Chemical, bacteriological and incendiary warfare shall be prohibited under the conditions unanimously recommended by the Special Committee.

4. SUPERVISION.

There shall be set up a Permanent Disarmament Commission with the constitution, rights and duties generally as outlined in Part VI. of the draft Convention submitted by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, with such extension of its powers as may be deemed by the Conference necessary to enable the Convention to be effectively applied.

III. PREPARATION OF THE SECOND PHASE OF THE CONFERENCE.

The Conference requests the Bureau to continue its work during the period of adjournment of the General Commission, with a view to framing, with the collaboration (if necessary) of a Drafting Committee, draft texts concerning the questions on which agreement has already been reached. Such texts will be communicated to all delegations as soon as they are drafted, and will then be submitted to the Commission.

Points which call for detailed examination will be examined by the Bureau or by the appropriate Committees, with the assistance of the Governments concerned, in order that definite conclusions may be reached as soon as the General Commission meets again.

The questions which will form the subject of such examination are the following :

1. EFFECTIVES.

A strict limitation and a real reduction of effectives shall be brought about.

For this purpose, the Conference invites the Bureau to examine, with the collaboration of such delegations as it considers necessary, the proposal of President Hoover relating to effectives. These studies should take into consideration, in the case of each country, the actual conditions of defence and the number and character of its forces.

2. LIMITATION OF NATIONAL DEFENCE EXPENDITURE.

(a) The Conference shall decide on the resumption of its labours, taking into account the special conditions of each State, what system of limitation and publicity of expenditure on national defence will provide the peoples with the best guarantee of an alleviation of their financial burdens, and will prevent the measures of qualitative and quantitative disarmament to be inserted in the Convention from being neutralised by increases or improvements in authorised armaments.

(b) With a view to the decisions to be taken under this head, the Conference requests the Committee on National Defence Expenditure and its technical Committee to continue and complete the work entrusted to its organs and to submit their report as soon as possible. The Conference requests its Bureau to draw up, on the basis of this report, a plan accomplishing the purpose aimed at and taking into consideration the special conditions of the various States.

3. TRADE IN AND MANUFACTURE OF ARMS.

The Bureau will set up a special Committee to submit proposals to the Conference, immediately

on the resumption of its work, in regard to the regulations to be applied to the trade in and private and State manufacture of arms and implements of war.

4. NAVAL ARMAMENTS.

As regards the proposals made by President Hoover and other related proposals concerning naval armaments, the Conference invites the Powers parties to the Naval Treaties of Washington and London, which have already produced important results, to confer together and to report to the General Commission, if possible before the resumption of its work, as to the further measures of naval reduction which might be feasible as a part of the general programme of disarmament.

The Conference further invites the naval Powers other than the Powers parties to the above Treaties to make arrangements for determining the degree of naval limitation they are prepared to accept in view of the Washington and London Treaties and the general programme of disarmament envisaged in the present resolution.

The Bureau will be kept informed of the progress of these negotiations, which it will be its duty to co-ordinate within the framework of the General Convention in preparation for the comprehensive decisions of the General Commission.

5. VIOLATIONS.

Rules of international law shall be formulated in connection with the provisions relating to the prohibition of the use of chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons and bombing from the air, and shall be supplemented by special measures dealing with infringement of these provisions.

6. FUTURE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE : PROCEDURE.

Pending the resumption of the meetings of the General Commission, the Bureau will keep the delegations informed of the progress of the work.

It will be for the Bureau to fix the date of the next meeting of the General Commission with one month's notice. The meeting of the General Commission shall take place not later than four months after the resumption of the work of the Bureau, which will meet during the week beginning September 19th, 1932.

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

The present resolution in no way prejudices the attitude of the Conference towards any more comprehensive measures of disarmament

or towards the political proposals submitted by various delegations.

V. ARMAMENTS TRUCE.

In order to ensure that, pending the resumption of the meetings of the General Commission and during the second phase of its work, no steps shall be initiated by any Power which might prejudice the preparation of the General Disarmament Convention, the Conference decides to recommend to the Governments to renew for a period of four months from November 1st, 1932, the truce provided for by the resolution of the Assembly of the League of Nations of September 29th, 1931.

The rapporteur then made a commentary on the resolution, of which the essential passages are given below.

In consultation with the Bureau of the General Commission, and more particularly with the President of the Conference, I set to work to put before you as quickly as possible a text which, in the Bureau's intention, was to record the points on which agreement has so far been reached—in other words, to give a general statement of the results of our work as they now stand—and to outline the programme of the second phase of the Conference which will begin after the summer holidays, and the procedure to be followed during that phase.

As you can imagine, the preparation of the draft resolution was a very laborious task.

I started on the basis of the text drawn up by Sir John Simon. I consulted a large number of delegations, asking some of them for specific proposals in writing and discussing at length with others the substantial questions that specially concerned them. Many delegations gave me general and detailed proposals, while others submitted amendments, chiefly on particular points in the texts I put before them.

For reasons of which we are all aware, it was obviously a difficult matter to reconcile all these texts. More than sixty nations with a wide variety of interests and ideas were demanding satisfaction; certain Powers of the first importance, which had repeatedly explained their views to you at length, would naturally have wished the resolution to reflect their ideas to the greatest possible extent, and to defer to all their interests as far as might be.

That meant that the rapporteur, whose duty it was to reconcile interests and convictions in the final text he was to propose, had to appeal to everyone to sacrifice some part of his original point of view in order to approach that of his colleagues. I accordingly endeavoured to embody in the resolution all that I could of the substantial proposals and formulas which were offered to me in the course of personal conversations by the British and American, French and Italian, German, Japanese, and Soviet delegations, by the group of eight countries, by the Eastern European countries, and by numerous other delegates.

A*2

It is chiefly due to the private conversations of certain Great Powers and the mutual concessions they have made during the last few days that it has been possible to establish the text of the resolution which represents the final compromise.

Sacrifices are painful in such circumstances, because the questions we are discussing sometimes affect the most important interests of one country or another. Yet they are necessary if we are to arrive at any definite result. In this discussion in which we are engaged, nobody can secure entire satisfaction. Consequently, I have to put before you a draft resolution representing a compromise with which I more than anyone else am not wholly satisfied, seeing that I have not been able to satisfy all my colleagues.

Having had occasion, however, more during the last few days than previously, to sound the feeling of the Conference, I have found that in the present state of our work, and in the general circumstances now prevailing, the text before you roughly represents the mean of the ideas, convictions and interests that are represented in this Conference to-day. I trust that the coming discussion on this draft will show that I have rightly judged the various currents of opinion in the Conference.

In any case, I would beg you to take these circumstances into consideration when you are tempted to move amendments to the resolution.

II. Examination of the Resolution—Preamble.

Now take the actual text of the resolution. You will see that it consists of three parts.

First, there is the preamble. It is, as it were, the Conference's profession of faith, as it emerges from the discussions that have taken place so far in the plenary Conference and the General Commissions; and it lays down at the outset two principles that we are following in drawing up the actual programme for the reduction and limitation of armaments.

The preamble states that we realise that substantial and extensive measures of disarmament as contemplated in our future work are calculated to consolidate the peace of the world, to hasten the solution of the economic crisis, to lighten the heavy financial burdens of our countries, and, above all, to arrest the competition in the power of armaments, which is threatening peace. It also refers to the two resolutions already passed by the General Commission, because all the Commission's resolutions should be mutually complementary and should form a single whole. It also refers to Article 8 of the Covenant of the League, whereby the Members of the League have undertaken to effect progressive reductions in their national armaments; and likewise to the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

Special emphasis is then laid on the initiative taken by the President of the United States; appreciation is expressed of his concrete proposals, which are cited in connection with the proposals made to the Conference by other delegations and the draft Convention of the Preparatory Commission; and the two important decisions of principle which the Conference is invited to take forthwith during this first phase of our work are indicated:

(1) First, that States undertake to effect a substantial reduction of their armaments based on the principle of the interdependence of the three classes—land, naval, and air armaments;

(2) Secondly, that the essential object of the decision we are taking is to reduce the means of aggression.

Be it expressly noted that in stressing the principles enunciated in these two decisions the resolution does not thereby exclude other principles or adopt them in advance, nor does it close the door to discussions on other suggestions that might be made. It is simply designed to place on record the results which the Conference has achieved; it merely fixes the points agreed on up to the present, but is not intended in any way to prejudice the Convention as a whole which will be adopted in its entirety at the close of the Conference. The points at present agreed upon would merely form a part of that Convention.

III. *Results of the First Phase of the Conference.*

The second part of the resolution is undoubtedly the most important. It places on record, as it were, the principal results of the work of the Conference up to date. Those results, as you are all aware, have been very generally criticised. I have come before you, not as their judge nor yet as their defender, but I simply wish to explain what they are, adding a few bare words to explain their significance. The conclusion summing up that work will then become apparent of itself.

If you go through the second part of the resolution and examine those points on which agreement is regarded as having been reached, you will note first that the draft resolution implies the definite adoption of one first principle of capital importance for the whole work of disarmament, namely, the principle of qualitative disarmament. You are asked to reduce and to limit the power and the number of those weapons which are most effective and most dangerous; for the moment, the weapons contemplated are aviation, heavy land and naval artillery and tanks. The adoption of such a measure would constitute a very substantial result, chiefly on account of the great principle of qualitative disarmament which would thus be expressly embodied for the first time in an international instrument. Undoubtedly the adoption of that principle would open the door to further progress.

There is a second general principle and one of the first importance which is no less significant: the draft resolution proposes that you should banish for ever from the society which is represented at this Conference certain barbarous, inhuman, and ignoble proceedings, such as bombardment from the air and the use of chemical, bacteriological, and incendiary weapons.*

The first objective is obviously to make it impossible in future that in any international armed conflict war should be waged against the civilian population or against old people or women or children, and to prevent the destruction of centres of great national civilisations, such as the capitals of great States or of lesser States, of precious works of art and architecture, which do not belong exclusively to any single nation or

to any single generation, not even to the nation or generation that have produced them.

The second purpose of this measure, which is to refrain in future, even in warfare, from doing unnecessary harm, is also of fundamental importance. True, it is urged, perhaps rightly, that no one can humanise war. That may be so. The reasons are well known. But I myself do not despair, when I see before me the delegates of practically every country in the world assembled here to discuss the ideas and principles of disarmament. I regard your presence as a proof that the society which you represent realises to what extent the destinies of the different nations are bound up one with another and to what extent the war of the future, with its technical progress, may threaten the very existence of modern civilisation. After having risen to this level of morality and international consciousness, the community of nations cannot be wanting in the courage to proclaim once for all that even in war unnecessary harm, ravage for the mere sake of ravage, destruction wrought for the mere love of destruction, must disappear for ever, as barbarous means unworthy of civilised men.

And lastly, it must not be forgotten that we are postulating here implicitly, for the future, an important principle, the principle that the progress of science and technique shall not be lost sight of in those very domains where they might lend themselves to abuse for the purposes of war of aggression.

I may add here that the total prohibition of bombardment from the air presupposes the existence of special measures mentioned in general terms in the resolution and referring both to military aviation and to civil aviation, for civil aviation machines of the same power as those which are to be prohibited for military aviation will have to be made subject to an international régime, so as to prevent their being used for purposes of bombardment. All the details of these measures, some of which are already indicated in the resolution, will form the subject of further discussions and decisions. For the moment we are simply adopting the principle of prohibition, with all its vital consequences for the future.

As regards the prohibition of chemical warfare, certain delegations, such as the Soviet delegation, for example, have proposed the signature and immediate ratification, by States which are not yet parties of the Geneva Protocol of June 17th, 1925. We felt that our proposal was perhaps better suited to present requirements. To-day we have got beyond the Protocol of 1925, and the new provisions framed by the Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference have supplemented and improved it. Those new provisions, in my view, constitute a general plan for the total prohibition of chemical and bacteriological warfare, a plan which has been well worked out and is acceptable to everyone.

The second part of the resolution proposes lastly a third important principle, namely, supervision over the execution of the Disarmament Convention which is to be concluded. It provides for the setting up of a Permanent Commission whose powers and prerogatives, generally speaking, would be on the lines

contemplated in the draft Convention framed by the Preparatory Commission. The resolution employs the term "generally speaking." It is clear then that the details of the constitution and powers of the Commission will form the subject of further discussions and decisions. I do not think that it is necessary, therefore, at the moment to analyse the constitution and powers of the Commission as provided for in the draft Convention framed by the Preparatory Commission, especially as the resolution which I am now submitting makes it clear that the Conference will decide to extend its powers to the extent that may be necessary for it to ascertain in practice that certain provisions of the Convention are being applied. What I do wish to stress, however, is the following capital fact: the constitution of such a Commission makes it impossible in future for there to be competition in armaments such as is found under the present conditions. All armaments will in future be under the direct or indirect supervision of the Commission; any increases will have to be brought to the knowledge of the Contracting Parties, and will indeed have to be approved by them. The absolute liberty which exists to-day will disappear, and for the first time in the history of the world the nations—thus following the principle already adopted at the Washington Conference—are about to bind themselves in regard to their own armaments.

I do not propose to examine at the moment how this machinery which is to be set up will work; I simply desire to note the tremendous progress in the relations of States one with another which is now being placed on record by a decision on these lines.

That is all that I wish to say in order to indicate the importance of the points on which agreement has been reached in our work up to date, points which are recorded in the second part of the resolution on which you will have to vote. If we decide to stop there for the moment that does not signify by any means that the first stage of disarmament will go no further. It means that, as regards the questions to which I have just referred, the first phase of the Conference has achieved practical results on which we can take a decision immediately, and that the second phase of the Conference will have to deal with all the other questions which we placed on our agenda at the beginning of the work of the Conference.

IV. Preparation of the Second Phase of the Conference.

The third part of the resolution concerns the preparation of the second phase of the Conference.

In the first place, the resolution does not propose that the work of the Conference should be interrupted; it proposes that the General Commission should adjourn just for a time, the Bureau, and certain Commissions of the Conference continuing their work in the meantime.

In point of fact, the decisions of principle contained in the second part of the resolution require to be worked out in detail; a certain number of texts, constituting articles of the Convention, will have to be prepared and submitted first to the delegations and then to the Commissions for adoption. That is the case, for

example, as regards the question of bombardment from the air, chemical warfare, and supervision. The framing of these texts can only be entrusted to a small committee. The resolution proposes that you should instruct the Bureau to take the necessary decisions in the matter, that is, to appoint a drafting committee which might co-opt certain technical organisations whose co-operation it might consider essential to keep in touch with the work of that committee and its organisations and to guide and supervise it. The concrete provisions which I have just mentioned give every delegation a guarantee that it will be kept in touch with all this work, that it can express an opinion on the texts, and that all element of surprise is precluded in advance.

During that interval the Bureau will have a second task to fulfil. As you will see in the texts relating to the limitation of the power and number of certain weapons, for example, guns and tanks, the resolution simply proclaims the principle, without giving figures. The statement of figures in such cases is not a technical question, nor is it a question that can be settled by means of persuasion in the course of lengthy discussions; it is, in my view, primarily a question of political possibilities. It seemed to me, then, after obtaining the opinion of many delegations, that it would be expedient that Governments should be given time to reflect after having adopted the principle, and that the Bureau should be asked to choose the best moment for beginning discussions and negotiations in regard to figures, in order that by consulting and keeping in constant touch with delegations, texts might be prepared on this essential question just as the texts of this resolution have now been submitted to you. It is felt that after further discussion and various private conversations the States most directly concerned will be able to give us definite proposals in the matter, to serve as a basis for our joint decisions.

Certain of my colleagues may think that the absence of figures weakens the resolution. I think that it would be still further weakened if at the present moment we could only submit figures which would be considered unsatisfactory.

A third duty entrusted to the Bureau under the terms of the resolution is that of preparing concrete decisions on questions of substance concerning which the Conference has only got half way towards achieving practical results. Those questions are as follows: effectives, national defence expenditure, trade in and manufacture of arms, naval armaments, and, lastly, the question of measures to be taken in the case of the violation of rules or of undertakings entered into concerning bombardment from the air and chemical and bacteriological warfare.

The resolution proposes that the Bureau should examine certain of these questions directly or through the medium of the proper committees and with the assistance of the Governments concerned, in order to be able to submit definite conclusions to the General Commission as soon as it meets again. In the first place, the Effectives Committee is to resume its work, on the lines to be laid down for it by the Bureau, on all the disputed questions which are at present suspending its activities. Secondly, the Expendi-

ture Commission is to continue as actively as possible the excellent work on which it has hitherto been engaged, and which, as its President, M. de Vasconcellos, told us the other day, seems likely to enable us to reach a decision, on the resumption of our work as to the principle of the limitation of expenditure on armaments. Lastly, a special committee will deal with the question of the trade in and manufacture of arms.

Some of my colleagues have informed me of their doubts on the subject of this procedure. They hesitate to agree to delegating these powers to the Bureau or to its drafting committee. They wish to participate directly in the work of preparing the second phase of the Conference.

Speaking quite impartially as is your rapporteur's duty, I would say that I fully understand all these misgivings and do not hesitate to communicate them to you. Personally I am alive both to the drawbacks and to the advantages of this procedure. If we invite all the members of the Conference who wish to do so, to take part in this work we shall be exposed to the difficulties which large assemblies have to contend with and which, for practical reasons, we should like to avoid during this further preparatory period. If we endeavoured to find a new criterion for the constitution of a new body to which such and such members of the Conference would belong, we should run the risk of giving offence to those States Members of the Conference which were unable to take part in the work in question, notwithstanding the constitution of a new enlarged body. We considered that the Bureau faithfully represents the various viewpoints of the Conference, so that confidence could be placed in it. On the other hand, we thought it necessary to fix the procedure in such a way that at each stage of the work detailed information is submitted to all the delegations, they can communicate their written observations, and have all the texts at their disposal before their governments are called upon to take decisions. The General Commission will itself decide upon the method of procedure best suited to the present needs of the Conference. I think that it will endorse my explanations.

As regards naval questions, the provisions of the resolution are quite clear. In view of the interdependence of the three categories of arms, the Powers which signed the Washington and London Treaties are invited to consult with each other and to inform the General Commission of the new measures of disarmament which come within the scope and general programme of disarmament to be effected by the Convention we are preparing.

In virtue of this resolution, the other Naval Powers which are not parties to those Treaties might take similar action, make their arrangements, and inform the Bureau and the General Commission in their turn as to the manner in which they propose to limit or reduce their naval forces.

As regards this latter provision, you will have seen that in the case of Powers which have not signed the Washington and London Treaties, the resolution refers solely to the limitation of naval armaments. This does not in any way

exclude the possibility of a reduction in view of the great diversity of the cases to be considered. It is obvious that Powers which did not sign the above-mentioned Treaties, and, secondary, Powers possessing maritime coasts and interests, have the right to defend them, and are consequently entitled to proportional naval armaments, which will, moreover, be fixed in this manner during the subsequent negotiations of the Conference. There are even certain maritime Powers which have only been in existence since the war, do not so far possess means of naval defence, and are only preparing their naval programme. After taking into account all these problems, we have drawn up the resolution in such a way as to safeguard in a just and equitable manner all the interests to which I have just referred.

But I should like to emphasise the fact that in neither case is it proposed to create groups of Powers who, independently of our organisation, would hold conferences apart or to prevent any Powers who may be taking part in the conversations of one group from taking part also in those of another. The intention is merely to have private conversations and obtain preliminary information with a view to collecting the necessary material for the decisions to be taken by our Conference. Contact or the exchange of information between the two groups of Powers would, of course, be possible also. The Bureau is to be kept informed of all these negotiations, will co-ordinate their results, and thus prepare the decisions to be taken by the General Commission.

Another important point also dealt with in this third part of the resolution is the following: practical measures having been contemplated with a view to the prohibition of bombing from the air and chemical warfare, we have been led to consider the necessity of examining the problem of violations of the obligations contracted by States on this matter. The Bureau will be instructed to deal with this problem with a view to the preparation of concrete proposals. It should be noted that this does not mean that our efforts in this field will stop short at this point. The question of the violation of all the other provisions of the general Disarmament Convention will naturally be carefully examined at a later stage of the work.

Lastly, this part of the resolution specifies that the Bureau is to keep the delegations informed of its work, and that its next meeting will take place during the week starting on September 19th. As soon as its work is sufficiently advanced, the Bureau will convene the General Commission, subject to one month's notice, and not later than four months after it has itself met for the first time. As you see, this provision limits the General Commission's vacation and forces the Bureau and the delegations concerned to expedite their conversations and particularly naval negotiations.

The last two points of the resolution are of special importance. Chapter IV. reserves all questions of a political nature raised during the Conference's discussions, as, for instance, that of security or equal rights. It also states that if we adopt this resolution to-day, we shall not thereby preclude the possibility of adopting later on during

our subsequent work more extensive measures than those mentioned in this resolution. In short, the resolution which I propose does not in any way prejudge the attitude of the Conference, which is free to take whatever decisions it thinks fit.

Lastly, since the Armaments Truce adopted by the League Assembly last year expires on November 1st of this year, the resolution proposes that Governments should be recommended to extend it for four months. As you see, we hope to work quickly and well so that before the end of this new period the General Disarmament Convention may be drawn up and concluded.

On July 21st and 22nd, the General Commission examined and approved the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph.

The Soviet delegation presented an amendment with a view to the substitution of the following text for the paragraph three of the Preamble :

"That a reduction of existing armaments by not less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. shall be effected in respect of all categories of land, naval and other armaments, with exemption for small countries respectively possessing armies of not above 30,000 men and a total naval tonnage of not above 100,000 tons, and also for countries which have been subjected to disarmament in virtue of other international agreements."

'Dr. Benes' text was maintained by thirty votes against five, and sixteen abstentions.

The voting was as follows :

Afghanistan, South Africa, the Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, France, Great Britain, Greece, the Hedjaz, India, Japan, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States, Yugoslavia voted for the resolution.

Albania, Colombia, Lithuania, Turkey and the Soviet Union voted against the resolution.

Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, the Irish Free State, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Siam and Venezuela abstained.

The Soviet delegation presented a second amendment for the substitution of the following text for the second phase of paragraph 1 of part 2.

"The High Contracting Parties agree to the complete prohibition of all aerial bombardment and the total abolition of bombing aircraft."

Dr. Benes' text was maintained by twenty-nine votes to nine, and twelve abstentions. The voting was as follows :

South Africa, the Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Great Britain, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Greece, India, the Irish Free State, Luxemburg, Mexico, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Siam, Spain, Switzerland, the United States and Yugoslavia voted for the maintenance of the text.

Afghanistan, Colombia, the Hedjaz, Hungary, Lithuania, Persia, Sweden, Turkey, the Soviet Union voted against the maintenance of the text.

Albania, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan and Latvia abstained.

The Netherlands and Swedish delegations submitted an amendment for the substitution of the following phrase for all texts concerning land artillery in the second part of paragraph 2 (Land Forces) :

"The Convention shall limit the number and maximum calibre of mobile land artillery."

The resolution was maintained by thirty-three votes to six, and ten abstentions.

The voting was as follows :

South Africa, the Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, France, Great Britain, Greece, Hedjaz, India, Irish Free State, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Siam, Switzerland, the United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia voted for the text of the resolution, rejecting the Netherlands-Swedish amendment.

Afghanistan, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the Soviet Union voted for the amendment.

Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Spain and Turkey abstained.

Further, the Soviet delegation submitted the following amendment to Part II., paragraph 2, to replace the existing phrase by the following :

"The High Contracting Parties agree to renounce the possession of any tanks whatsoever."

The original text of the resolution was adopted by twenty-six votes to six.

As regards the first paragraph of Part III. of the draft resolution, the Hungarian delegation asked that delegations wishing to do so should be allowed to assist on a footing of complete equality in the work of the Bureau.

The Hungarian amendment was rejected by twenty-five votes to ten.

A certain number of delegations, in particular those of the United States and Italy, had, in the course of the examination of the Preamble and of the discussion of the articles, given their general views on the draft resolution.

Before the ballot on the whole of the resolution the Austrian, Bulgarian, Canadian, Chilean, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Netherlands, Panama, Polish, Portuguese, Turkish, Soviet and United Kingdom delegations made statements on July 22nd and 23rd, explaining their vote.

After a statement by the President, Mr. Henderson, the General Commission, on July 23rd, adopted the draft resolution as a whole by forty-one votes to two and eight abstentions.

The voting was as follows :

South Africa, the Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hedjaz and Nejd, India, the Irish Free State, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, voted for the resolution.

Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics voted against.

Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Hungary, Italy and Turkey abstained.

After the vote of the General Commission, the plenary Conference met and adopted Chapter V. of the resolution (Armaments Truce). Forty-nine countries voted in favour of the text, China abstaining.

Before suspending the work of the General Commission, the President stated that, in accordance with paragraph VI. of the resolution, the Bureau would meet at Geneva on September 21st.

The *Naval Commission* elected M. Moresco (Netherlands) to succeed in the Chair M. Colban, who had resigned.

The *Sub-Committee of the Air Commission* examined the first part of the draft international regulations for civil aviation prepared by its rapporteur M. Lange (Norway).

The *Technical Committee of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure* finished its examination of material furnished by the following States : Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Italy, the United States, Poland and Switzerland. The material furnished by South

Africa, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Irish Free State, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Roumania, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is now being examined.

The *Moral Disarmament Committee* finished its first reading of the draft text on questions of education, co-operation of intellectual circles, broadcasting and the cinematograph in their relation to moral disarmament.

The following is an analysis of the speeches made in the General Commission during the discussion of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Gibson (U.S.A.). The United States of America would have preferred a resolution accepting still more definitely the details of President Hoover's plan, but the American delegation felt that the present resolution contained the maximum of agreement which could at present be achieved, all of which was in the direction of the President's proposal, and offered the best hope of eventual attainment of that goal. For that reason the American delegation supported the resolution, realising that it contained nothing to preclude it from pressing at later stages for more definite and far-reaching measures.

He expressed on behalf of the American delegation sincere thanks to those Governments which had given support by adhering to the President's plan. This support alone had made possible the measure of agreement registered in the resolution.

He was very grateful to M. Benes for his unfailing energy and resourcefulness in helping to formulate the resolution. It represented a first step toward realistic disarmament, since it contained an engagement for the substantial reduction of the wide range of existing armaments. Hitherto debate had been confined to methods, now the Conference was deciding what to do in the way of concrete measures of reduction and giving directions that methods be found for carrying out these measures. Therefore, although the resolution did not go all the way, it recognised that President Hoover's plan constituted a goal and set out on what seemed a proper path to attain it by accepting certain general principles, the establishment of means to consolidate them, and the examination of others with a determination to attain the ends which they proposed.

All recognised that the principle of unanimity in international gatherings was the bulwark of national independence, and therefore when an agreement was reached it represented not the point to which daring leaders had attained, nor even the position occupied by perhaps a great majority of States, but rather that point which the last straggler seeking the same goal had passed. Therefore, the resolution meant that the opinion of the nations was much farther towards the goal than was thought, and as the bulk of public opinion was in favour of going farther the Commission would be assured that the moderate accomplishment now recorded would serve merely as a base for further forward movement.

The discussion in the General Commission revealed that a large group of delegations were now prepared to abolish bombardment aviation and prohibit bombardment from the air. However, in the

intensive consultations of the past few weeks certain States showed that they had genuine difficulties still to surmount before agreeing to those measures. There had been a disposition to set the present measure of agreement as a point of departure, and to devote the next phase of the work to finding a way over or around existing obstacles in the hope of agreeing upon more far-reaching measures.

Up to the present there had never been a general treaty for the limitation and reduction of arms which entailed relief to every country from the danger of surprise by its neighbour and from the necessity for the costly competition in arms and men. Once the world experienced that relief, tension would relax and further progress be achieved. The best defence of a nation was the goodwill of its neighbours. The best way to attain that goodwill was to enter into engagements for reducing the means of attack against one another. The present resolution was a first step in that direction.

It contained definite commitments for general reductions of land material and effectives. It took into account the lessons of the last war when damage and destruction spread to the civil population, and contained the strict undertaking to prevent recurrence of this abuse. It recognised the necessity for lightening the financial burdens which war and preparations for war imposed upon the world, and proposed to contribute to economic recovery by reducing the means to these ends and giving assurance against competition either in quantity or quality of arms.

There had not been time to work out the details of various proposals. For instance, the Committee on National Defence Expenditure had not yet been able to complete its studies. The resolution thus did not attempt to prejudge the results of those studies and on the conclusions to be derived from them each nation would be its own judge. The resolution left open whether global limitation or limitation on material as complementary to direct limitation of expenditure or an option between these methods should be the ultimate goal.

Global limitation had been consistently opposed by the United States Government as applied to itself since it considered that such a method was unfair to a nation like the United States which had already drastically reduced its armaments, and his Government had made clear that it could not accept such a method for itself. However the resolution left open the possibility for other Governments to adopt this method as between themselves if they deemed it desirable. The resolution, however, accorded with the position the United States had always maintained that any of these methods should be destined to supplement and check direct limitation.

The Bureau and various committees would carry on during the recess of the General Commission. Meanwhile, the various Governments would undertake to see how much farther they could go to complete agreements. World public opinion must help them in their task. The peoples of the world might not know the technical difficulties of disarmament, but they had the will to surmount them, and it was for them to make possible the achievement of far more than the resolution.

The present resolution represented a great advance when the atmosphere of caution with which the

Conference opened was remembered. A long and definite stride toward disarmament had been taken.

The United States delegation might, in view of the support which had been given to the President's plan, have summoned the Conference to accept or reject it in its entirety. This would undoubtedly show an impressive body of opinion in favour of acceptance, but it must be remembered that no State was bound by a majority vote and that, therefore, such procedure would bring the world no nearer to general agreement, which was essential to the realisation of the United States plan. The other course was to consolidate the measure of accord which could now be reached and to accept the principles to be used as a guide.

Therefore, he considered the resolution as the embodiment of those immediate steps of reduction and limitation which should constitute a pledge of the intention of the nations of the world to attain that full measure of disarmament which the world expected.

M. Ansari (Persia) said the Persian delegation supported the draft resolution or any other more radical suggestion subject to the following conditions :—

1. That there was reciprocity in regard to reductions and that the consent of Persia was subordinated to the observations which he had made on July 8th at the twenty-first meeting of the Commission.

2. That a proper control be instituted over the manufacture of arms, but that Persia should not be required to assume an undertaking the effect of which would be to revive the Convention on Arms Traffic of 1925 which had affected Persia's sovereignty. Persia was, however, ready to discuss this question and hoped that she would be represented on any committee established for the purpose of doing so.

3. Persia had always been in favour of a permanent organisation to supervise the proper execution of the Disarmament Convention. This organisation should be universal and not limited to a few privileged States. It was therefore absolutely necessary that the control of the Convention in each Continent should be entrusted to sub-committees composed of representatives of all Powers possessing common frontiers in that Continent.

4. In so far as the proposal for the prolongation of the armaments truce was concerned, Persia would agree to it subject to the same reservations as she had made to the Italian proposal of last year.

General Balbo (Italy) wished to make clear a number of fundamental principles which had consistently formed the basis of his country's action. The Conference had recognised the principle of the interdependence of armaments and of their reduction and had also agreed that the reduction of all means of aggression should be achieved. Merely to formulate a principle, in itself inadequate, was not sufficient, and positive achievement in the domain of disarmament had made no real progress, the inequalities and lack of proportion with which the problem of disarmament in regard to land,

naval, and air forces had been considered affording ample proof of this.

In so far as naval problems were concerned, the resolution merely indicated a method of work and gave no final or concrete standard for reduction. It only corresponded imperfectly therefore with the Italian views on this point. Since the Hoover proposals were inspired by the same principles as the Italian plan, the Government of Italy had unconditionally adhered to them, and the desire of Fascist Italy to achieve radical disarmament had been clearly demonstrated.

A declaration of goodwill was not, however, in the Italian Government's view, sufficient from the Powers attending the Conference, for the world expected concrete and definite conclusions. The Italian delegation, after having tried by every means to promote the triumph of principles, of which the adoption would lead to positive results, was compelled to declare that the effort accomplished had been vain and far below the hopes of the world. He would therefore abstain from voting, and this abstention would apply to the resolution as a whole and to each of its parts.

The Italian delegation had no difficulty in accepting the Conference's proposal recommending Governments to renew the armaments truce recommended by the Assembly in its resolution of September 29th.

M. Bosch (Argentina) said that the Argentine delegation which had already adhered to the Hoover proposals, also adhered to the recommendations in the report of M. Benes, and hoped that when they were studied in detail the geographical and demographical position of the Argentine would be remembered as a reason for justifying an occasional divergence of view in regard to some of the principles and conclusions in the resolution.

M. Rutgers (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands delegation would vote for the resolution. It regretted that the paragraph concerning air bombardment was not more explicit as to the consequences of the principle which it proclaimed. It regretted that the paragraph concerning tanks was really equivalent to deciding nothing, and it regretted that the resolution contained declarations with regard to the qualitative limitation of land artillery which could not serve as a basis for an article of the Convention under preparation by the Netherlands delegation, and of which the achievement would be impossible.

On the other hand, the resolution contained various decisions showing very notable progress :—

(1) It proclaimed the principle of the abolition of all air bombardment. This was not a decision which the Conference had taken lightly. It was a political undertaking entered into after due reflection ;

(2) The resolution took a first step towards the direct quantitative limitation of artillery by demanding the limitation in number of all heavy land artillery of a certain calibre ;

(3) The resolution absolutely condemned chemical, bacteriological, and incendiary warfare, and this necessarily involved the prohibition of all preparation for this form of warfare ;

(4) The resolution was quite clear as to the necessity not only of a strict limitation but also of a real reduction of effectives.

Without wishing to emphasise the clauses which gave greater or less satisfaction to the Netherlands delegation, M. Rutgers would merely note once more that the resolution in no way prejudged the attitude of the Conference with regard to wider measures of disarmament. This clause, therefore, made it possible to entertain hopes which the Netherlands delegation would do all that lay in its power to realise.

In order that the results of the second session of the Conference should surpass those of its first session an indispensable condition was necessary. Public opinion, enlightened by its authorised guides—first and foremost by the daily press—should continue actively to support the Conference. The Conference would only succeed if public opinion became more awake, more alert, and more enthusiastic.

M. Nadolný (Germany) said that it was more difficult for those States already disarmed under the Peace Treaties than for other members of the Conference to pronounce on the resolution recording the results so far achieved and indicating the nature of the further work.

The position for States disarmed under the Peace Treaties was to see that their disarmament was followed by general disarmament in harmony with their own level of armaments. Other States had merely to state their satisfaction or otherwise with the term of the resolution as applied to their own armaments.

The disarmed countries had demanded the reduction of armaments to the lowest possible level and equality of rights—i.e., the substitution for the present state of unilateral disarmament of the system provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant, applied equally to all countries.

Generalisation of disarmament was to be one of the first acts accomplished by the League of Nations. It had been promised to Germany in 1919 ; it was now 1932. The German people had throughout that period shown the greatest patience and the greatest moderation, particularly during the present Conference. A great deal of goodwill and courage had been necessary to enable Germany to attend the Conference after the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of Article 53 of its draft, requiring from Germany the confirmation of the discriminatory régime imposed by the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty.

The German delegation had done its utmost to work jointly with other delegations in order to achieve progress in disarmament, and to close a chapter of post-war history which should have been closed long since.

For months all the nations of the world had followed with astonishment the curious spectacle of the Conference's work. Despite an abundance of proposals, and suggestions, no tangible results were visible. President Hoover's proposals, however, although they did not go as far as those of the German delegation, based upon the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, undoubtedly furnished a solid basis for the Conference's work.

The British proposals, too, were an important contribution, although they did not cover everything to be achieved. The German delegation was particularly happy to welcome the Italian proposals on qualitative disarmament—one of the most important factors in shaping the course of the Conference.

Again, the proposals made by the Soviet Government for quantitative disarmament gave yet other grounds for hope.

Unfortunately, negative forces had arisen to counter there excellent intentions. Public opinion could not understand the slowness of the Conference's work, and the period of preparation and preliminary work must now definitely come to an end and the period of achievement begin.

The resolution was in this respect a disappointment.

On April 22nd the General Commission had accepted the great principle of qualitative disarmament—of decisive importance for the work of the Conference. To what extent did this resolution take account of that principle? It repeated the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological warfare already decided upon by the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

To turn to the measures dealing with heavy artillery, these were subjected to so many conditions that, in view of the attitude adopted by various Governments in the Land Commission, it was difficult to see how really practical and decisive measures could ensue. Moreover, how would it be possible to ensure the protection of civil populations against bombardment by the long-range artillery of the field armies and of fortresses situated in proximity to the frontier?

He had every sympathy with the observations of the Swedish delegate and the delegates of the Netherlands and the Soviet Union.

The establishment of a maximum unit tonnage for tanks had been provided for, but no figure was mentioned. The Land Commission's discussions gave reason to fear that certain States would want to fix a figure which would fail to cover the great majority of tanks actually existing.

The chapter on Air Forces seemed to meet a demand which the German delegation had also previously raised—namely, the complete prohibition of air bombardment. In the view of the German delegation, however, a measure of that kind should find its expression and safeguards in the complete abolition of military aviation. The resolution however, merely prohibited as between contracting States the throwing of bombs, and made no provision for the complete abolition of the means for bombing, nor did it prohibit the preparation of such means or the training of the personnel involved.

He had been surprised to gather that the existence of a very limited number of large-size commercial aeroplanes was felt to be an obstacle to the absolute prohibition of air bombing. Such an opinion appeared less justified, in that all had agreed to set up a régime which would be calculated to preclude the use for military purposes of civil aviation in the event of drastic measures being applied in the field of military aviation.

The situation was no more satisfactory in the field of quantitative disarmament. The immediate acceptance of the proposals of the Hoover Plan would have meant definite progress—an effective numerical reduction. The mandate given to the Bureau to examine these proposals committed no one, and nothing had been said on the highly important questions of general conscription and trained reserves or the direct limitation of the authorised land material.

There was, therefore, no reason to be pleased with this result of six long months of work, and

the German delegation was unable to regard the resolution as satisfactory.

Notwithstanding this, the German delegation might, in the hope that a further energetic endeavour would be made in the second phase of the Conference, perhaps have been content with a simple abstention from the vote, or would perhaps even have found it possible to accept the resolution, subject to certain reservations, had that resolution recognised the principle of equality of rights.

The moment had come for the Conference to pronounce itself on this principle and on its practical application, for the resolution represented a first concrete step in the direction of general disarmament and contained provisions from which it appeared quite clearly that general disarmament would not follow the lines of that imposed on Germany. It also contained certain provisions requiring of his country further undertakings and obligations not at present incumbent upon it. Consequently a prompt decision on the principle of equality of rights became indispensable. His delegation had already declared to the author of the resolution and the countries most concerned its readiness to enter into immediate negotiations as to the application of the principle, proposing a formula based both on the spirit and the letter of Article 8 of the Covenant. It had found, to its great regret, that unanimous agreement could not be secured. Germany could, moreover, never append her signature to a convention which did not rest upon the principle of equality of rights.

He drew attention in this connection to resolutions recently passed in Paris by the Federation of the League of Nations Societies, and to other declarations of international organisations.

In the circumstances, Germany was unfortunately, despite her goodwill, unable to accept the resolution submitted, and his Government had instructed him to make the following declaration:—

"The German Government is ready to continue its collaboration in the work of the Disarmament Conference in order to contribute by all means in its power to the endeavours now being made to achieve a really decisive step towards general disarmament within the meaning of Article 8 of the Covenant. Nevertheless, its collaboration is only possible when the later work of the Conference is carried out on the basis of a clear and definite recognition of the principle of equality of rights as between nations. Equality of rights is the fundamental principle upon which the League of Nations and the community of States in general rests.

"If the Conference were to draw up rules and principles for general disarmament of States, excluding at the same time Germany or other States and subjecting any State to an exceptional and discriminatory régime, such an attitude would be incompatible with the feelings of national honour and international justice. It would also be contrary to the treaty rights which Germany holds and which it cannot abandon. To its great regret the German Government notes that the present resolution takes no account of that view. The work of the first phase of the Conference, and in particular the conversations of the last few days, have, on the contrary, given the impression that this necessary condition has not yet

been understood or accepted by all Governments. The German Government is of opinion that this uncertainty regarding one of the fundamental questions of the problem of disarmament makes it impossible for useful work to be done. It must, therefore, press for its doubts to be dispelled by the recognition without delay of equality of all States as regards national security and the enforcement of all provisions of the convention.

"So far as the various questions which arise out of the application of the principle of equality of rights might need to be investigated, the German Government is ready to enter at once into negotiations with the Governments concerned. The German Government must, however, point out at once that it cannot undertake to continue its collaboration if a satisfactory solution on this decisive point for Germany is not reached by the time the Conference resumes its work."

Such is the declaration which my Government has instructed me to make. I hope that the condition upon which the subsequent attitude of Germany depends will be fulfilled, and that we shall thus be able, in agreement with you, to enter upon the second phase of the Conference, and that that phase will be more fruitful than the first and will bring us to the goal.

M. Dupré (Canada) said that the progress noted in the draft resolution, though not all that might be desired, was nevertheless real. It was possible to mark progress if the present atmosphere were compared with that of the prudence and reserve in which the Conference had opened. Each delegation had sacrificed something of its original views and had drawn nearer to the views of others. Thanks to these mutual concessions a final compromise had been drawn up. Wide questions of principle had been settled. Honourable undertakings had been entered into which would control public opinion. The representative of Canada laid special emphasis on the invitation addressed to the Powers which had signed the Naval Agreements of Washington and London, and the definite instructions given to the Bureau. Obviously the resolution contained a minimum of what was to be achieved, but that minimum represented the maximum of agreement reached between the most strongly armed Powers. There would be no advantage in breaking the common front established by those Powers. The Canadian delegation was in favour of the resolution of which the text contained nothing preventing the future adoption of more definite measures approaching nearer to the final object.

Count Apponyi (Hungary) wished to explain the reasons why the Hungarian delegation abstained from voting. Its attitude in the general problem of the limitation and reduction of armaments had already been defined. In so far as Hungary was concerned, there were two essential objects to be attained at this first stage: a substantial reduction of armaments and the removal of the inequalities existing in the international situation by reason of the peace treaties. These inequalities could only be considered as temporary and must disappear when the problem of the reduction of armaments had been settled. It was from this two-fold point of view that the representative of Hungary would examine the draft resolution.

In so far as the substantial reduction of armaments was concerned, the rapporteur had said that great progress had been achieved owing to the fact that the principle of the international regulation of armaments had been recognised by all, as well as the principle of qualitative and quantitative limitation. This was indeed great progress in the evolution of international law, but the first of these results was not due to the present Conference. It had been achieved as soon as the Covenant of the League had entered into force. The second principle—that of the qualitative and quantitative reduction of armaments—was the achievement of this Conference and constituted real progress. Since, however, this achievement was only two months old he wondered whether sufficiently substantial progress had been made to make it possible to accept the draft resolution with confidence. To this question Count Apponyi must reply in the negative. The resolution enumerated the results already achieved, but a simple enumeration, acceptance of which bound no one, contained many omissions and inaccuracies. Reference therein was made to questions which in substance had not been seriously discussed, at any rate in public, any more than they had been in either the Technical or, above all, the Political Commissions. To take an example—it would have been possible to speak of a result in so far as heavy guns were concerned if a maximum calibre of 155 mm. had been fixed such as had been accepted by a large majority composed of 19 delegates as against 3 in the Technical Commission. The few great Powers who had taken part in the private conversations lasting over two months had only reached agreement very lately. How could an assembly composed of about sixty delegations take a decision on a new proposal when a similar time for preparation had not been afforded it?

The achievements noted represented, as compared with the problems to be settled, a result so small, if indeed any result had been achieved, that it would have been better not to have included them in the resolution which would thus have gained in force in the eyes of public opinion.

In the representative of Hungary's view, this was due to the system of private conversations followed during the last two months. Such a system had isolated certain great Powers from contact with public opinion and with other delegations. This was the only fruitful form of contact as he would explain. He was fully convinced that important decisions must be adopted in the first place by the great Powers. The legal equality of all nations was a principle which it was necessary to know how to use in a spirit of healthy reality. When all was said and done, the great nations had the right to a preponderating voice in view of the fact that their responsibilities were greater. But they should not make up their minds as to the final decision without entering into contact with small countries and with public opinion, and without taking account of the main currents of that opinion as represented by those countries. Further, what distinguished in substance the international system represented by the League of Nations to-day from the former universal anarchy, was the continual contact of States and the consequent ideal influence they might exercise. It was precisely that absence of contact with the main currents of opinion which had occurred in regard to the Conference, and this

might be the reason why the draft resolution lacked that vital force without which great things could not be accomplished. The Commission should remember the day on which the Hoover plan was submitted and its full and wholehearted acceptance on the part of Italy. It would then call to mind the enthusiastic and spontaneous applause which had broken out at that moment. If it remembered that, it could imagine what would have happened had the draft resolution, instead of containing a number of somewhat ambiguous phrases announcing the study to which it was to be submitted, informed the world that the Conference had unanimously accepted a 33½ per cent. reduction. The reason why the delegate of Hungary was unable to support this statement showing the results of the Conference, which was perhaps superfluous, was because he thought the text of the resolution to be quite inadequate.

He had voted in the negative on certain points, not to protest, for example, against the prohibition of certain kinds of air bombardment, but because certain exceptions had been allowed. The welcome afforded to the principle of the total prohibition of all air warfare proclaimed by M. Motta on behalf of nine delegations, gave rise to the hope that the final object would be achieved and the total abolition of military aviation effected. It was for that reason that he would abstain from voting on the resolution as a whole. It was stipulated that the resolution in no way prevented a more complete reduction. Count Apponyi did not wish in voting for it to appear to undertake to be contented with what had been done if further progress in the future could not be achieved. The most he could do was to abstain.

The second essential principle for the Hungarian delegation was the recognition of the legal equality of all States and the disappearance of distinctions in the matter of armaments between vanquished nations and victorious nations. These distinctions must give place to a form of control applying to all, and such control was indeed laid down in Article 8 of the Covenant. In so far as this principle was concerned the draft resolution did no more than refrain from prejudging it. The German delegation had considered itself unable to proceed further until this principle was immediately recognised. The Hungarian delegation was prepared to accept for the moment the proposal that the Conference's decision should remain in suspense, because it was under the impression that this principle was making progress and time should therefore be allowed for it to develop until the final decision was taken. This, however, was merely a difference in tactics, and there was no divergence in principle between the nations who had been compelled by the Peace Treaties to undergo unilateral disarmament. Count Apponyi repeated that no Hungarian Government would ever adhere to a convention which was not founded on this principle, of which the execution must take place in a stated period of time. This right of equality was not, to borrow an expression sometimes used—a "German" thesis—any more than it was a Hungarian or an Austrian. It was a principle of natural law, a condition of the co-existence of nations. On this point, any discussion would be impossible at the moment of the final decision, for this was a question of dignity and

honour, more imperative when applied to a nation than when applied to an individual.

The following were the reasons why he still had confidence. One of the principal lay in the events of Lausanne. The work accomplished at Lausanne was great not only because of its economic and financial consequences, but because of the moral achievement which was that Lausanne had caused the distinction between the conquerors and conquered to disappear and had established one single category of nations in the economic and financial field. The opportunity had now arrived to take an enormous step forward towards the real pacification of the world, and the re-establishment of co-operation by achieving the disappearance of the difference between the treatment of nations with regard to armaments. If the Powers concerned refused to take this step, and this appeared to him to be impossible, the situation would be far worse, and it was no use continuing to talk of international solidarity. This, however, was an impossible hypothesis both from a logical, psychological, and political point of view, for it was inconceivable that nations which had reached such heights at Lausanne could now move in the opposite direction at Geneva.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) pointed out that the object of the resolution was threefold.

The first object was to record the progress made, and to consolidate the results attained; delegations might express their regret that these were not greater, but they must at least keep a balanced mind and remember that this was only the first of three objects.

The second was to acknowledge the stirring call made by President Hoover; he had been glad to hear M. Nadolny refer to this as a firm and solid platform for the Conference's tasks. The platform must be occupied and the task continued. There was such a thing as "being more Royalist than the King." Since the United States delegation was not voting against the resolution, it would be a pity were any delegation to be more "Hoover" than the Americans.

The third object of the resolution was to prepare for the second phase of the Conference. Two conditions must be fulfilled by such a resolution if it were to do no injury to any interest or to any delegation present. It must contain no commitment which contradicted the essential convictions of any delegation, and it must reserve questions not as yet dealt with so that no delegation should, in voting for it, be asked to renounce any principle dear to his country.

He claimed that this resolution fulfilled both those conditions, and that once the Commission bore in mind that no one was being invited to treat this as a final decision, it must realise that no argument advanced would justify voting against the resolution.

Opinion might differ as to its value. He had been glad to hear the Canadian delegate assert that in the view of his delegation a very real advance had been made, and while he deplored that there was not more to be found in this document than it contained, he believed that it contained more and more of value than had been feared a few weeks earlier. The question had been raised as to how at the end of the Conference certain States would

stand who had, at the end of the war, found themselves under a special régime in the matter of armaments. He knew this to be one of the fundamental questions that the Conference still had to decide; he fully understood the intense feeling that lay behind that demand, but at the same time, if a subject of such magnitude were to be introduced before the Commission recorded its vote, where was it going to stop? Admit the one, and the Commission might find that before the vote the whole French thesis of security was to be put into the forefront. He submitted that the resolution was for the purpose of recording matters already discussed, and not a vehicle for the purpose of carrying any other load, however essential that load might be.

M. Rutgers had declared that he was ready to contribute to efforts made to realise a decisive step towards general disarmament in the sense of Article 8 of the Covenant. Surely, then, he must look favourably on a resolution which put the very text of Article 8 in the forefront of its proposals.

If the resolution were to be the final result of the Conference's work, many delegations would join in rejecting the whole, but when in fact these great political questions had never been discussed, and when in Part IV. of the resolution its authors had expressly stated that it in no way prejudged the attitude of the Conference towards any more comprehensive measures of disarmament or towards the political proposals submitted by various delegations, he would appeal for its consideration in the light in which he had tried to put it. Count Apponyi who, though the oldest was yet the youngest delegate, because of his inveterate habit of looking to the future, had referred to the success of the Lausanne Conference. That success had been due to the fact that no one had impatiently demanded results, but that these had developed from the series of practical solutions put forward.

He could well understand that the world outside is impatient. It was easy to show impatience, but only little by little, like the tide encroaching upon the seashore, were results achieved and consolidated. The Conference's labour had not been in vain. He was convinced that in the end the judgment of public opinion would show itself to be the strongest force on earth. The Conference must look forward and resolve to move out of the post-war period into a new era of peace.

M. Pfügl (Austria) wished to explain why the Austrian delegation abstained from voting. In the first place, though it could not support the draft resolution, it saw in it the fruit of serious effort which made it possible for delegations to reach an understanding on a certain number of results forming an undoubted progress towards disarmament. This was particularly true with reference to the place given to initiative of President Hoover and to the admission of the principle of qualitative disarmament. On the other hand, the text only contained a small part of the demands of the Austrian people in regard to a general effective reduction of armaments which should be as radical as possible. Further, the text contained nothing concerning legal equality on the basis of Article 8 of the Covenant. This was the view of the Austrian people on the resolution destined not only to close

the present phase of the Conference but also to serve as a starting point for the new phase. The final attitude of Austria towards the Convention itself would depend on the place which the Austrian people would be given among the future signatories.

The Austrian delegation took note of the observations of the rapporteur to the effect that security and equality of rights were included in the political proposals put forward by various delegations. In that respect the resolution in no way prejudged the final attitude of the Conference.

M. Herriot (France) said that the French delegation would vote for the resolution since it intended to take its share in work which had been very difficult to accomplish because the problem had been to descend from the heights of idealism to the plains of reality. This could not be effected without sacrifice.

France had already shown her desire for peace when eight years previously she had shared in the drafting of the Protocol. Since then the reduction and the limitation of armaments had been undertaken in another field and in another form. The importance of the proposals of President Hoover must be recognised in regard to this work. His declaration was based on an idea which had not perhaps been sufficiently emphasised. Referring to the Briand-Kellogg Pact, which should be strengthened, the American proposals proclaimed that armaments ought to be reserved for national defence, and that the forces of aggression should be diminished in order to increase comparatively the forces of protection. This was a principle which should not be lost sight of, and to which France fully adhered.

Budgetary Reduction.—The French delegation would willingly go further than the text of the resolution on certain points, particularly in regard to budgetary expenditure. Sums spent on armaments must be clearly, loyally, and openly accounted for in each country. France would accept control over the expenditure on armaments without reservation. If this limitation of expenditure were not achieved the Commission should remember that it would be impossible to attack the dangerous manufacture of spare parts or the formation of secret or clandestine military associations. To show its sincerity the French Government had just induced the French Parliament to adopt a reduction of about 10 per cent. in the military expenditure of France.

Manufacture of Arms.—The French delegation hoped that the Special Committee contemplated in the resolution would deal with the private or public manufacture of arms and war material. It was determined to uphold the proposal to reduce the unit tonnage of capital ships as well as the calibre of heavy land artillery to the lowest figure agreed upon for heavy naval artillery. The adoption of this proposal confirmed the fifth principle in the Hoover proposal, which dealt with the interdependence of armaments.

Chemical, Bacteriological, and Incendiary Warfare.—A first step in this direction had been taken and chemical, bacteriological, and incendiary warfare had been prohibited. As the Netherlands representative had urged, this prohibition, to be effective, must apply not only to the use but also to the preparation of these barbarous methods of warfare.

Air Bombardment.—Another essential result had just been achieved owing to the fact that air bombardment had been abolished, providing that an effective international régime were instituted to prevent the illicit use of civil aircraft and their transformation into war machines. As Sir John Simon had pointed out, this proviso was necessary in common fairness. The French delegation would put forward a detailed proposal for the internationalisation of civil aviation. It would thus be seen that even confined as it was to this first phase, the resolution achieved an essential result; for the Conference desired, in attacking the most powerful and the most costly forms of armaments, to put an end to the practice of turning the most recent discoveries of modern science towards the illegitimate direction of war.

Problem of Effectives.—The representative of France would explain his views with equal frankness in regard to the future work of the Conference. In so far as effectives were concerned, the methods of calculation proposed in the Hoover plan, which transformed military forces into internal police forces, colonial police forces, and defence police forces, seemed to run counter to the French view. Precisely, however, because the French delegation was frankly moving in this direction, it thought that it would be right to submit the three following observations to its American friends and to President Hoover for their consideration :—

(1) In calculating effectives account should be taken not only of visible forces but also of the real forces of a State, not only of openly established organisations but also of secret organisations.

(2) To calculate the military index on the demographical index would be to award an unjust premium to quantity and to favour what might be called mass imperialism. Great nations would thus be able to obtain effectives in such numbers that they would hold small nations at their mercy.

(3) The Hoover proposal had made no provision for the possibility of a coalition between nations, each one of which had limited its effectives. This danger already existed, but the object of the Conference's work was precisely to protect all nations by a statute which, while compelling them to disarm, would at the same time guarantee their security.

The French view.—It was the duty of the French delegation to recall certain principles which it considered indispensable for the achievement of a final result. These principles were already contained in the draft resolution, as Count Carton de Wiart had pointed out, for at the outset control was established in the form of a Permanent Disarmament Commission "with such extension of its powers as may be deemed by the Conference necessary to enable the Convention to be effectively applied." The resolution demanded the adoption of rules of international law and of special measures covering the violation of the regulations concerning chemical, bacteriological, and incendiary weapons. The rapporteur had added in his observations that the question of the violation of all the other provisions of the Convention would be carefully examined during the course of the future work,

Two words should be borne in mind : control and measures. The general statute for disarmament would be neither effective nor admissible unless it were accompanied by measures making possible the control of its execution and the suppression of any attempts to violate it.

In commenting upon Chapter IV., the rapporteur had said that the question of security had been reserved since it was of a political nature. The fact that in the French view security must be associated with disarmament was well known. It was also associated with the idea of arbitration, but France did not ask security for herself alone. She wished all nations, small or great, to possess it whether they were ex-enemies or ex-allies, and she thought that security would mean the solution of political problems which could not be dealt with by ignoring it.

The day on which an international organisation were created, according to the spirit and letter of the Covenant, ensuring each party security and imposing upon each identical obligations, the settlement of the question raised by Count Apponyi would be greatly facilitated. When the time came, the French delegation would make sure that this guarantee had been obtained before being able fully and entirely to adhere to the Convention. At any moment the reduction in armaments might increase in proportion as international security became more solidly organised. The outlawry of war must be achieved by outlawing the aggressor; weak nations and possible victims must be afforded the effective protection of the community of nations.

France intended fully to respect the freedom of all just as she desired her own freedom to be respected. She hoped that the work undertaken would mean the establishment of an international organisation, the necessity of which was universally apparent and which would achieve the loyal association of peoples within the spirit of the Covenant. The French delegation continued to hope for this result, and would vote for the resolution without any inner reserves.

M. Erich (Finland) said that the Finnish delegation regretted that the real and tangible results hitherto achieved had not been more ample and more substantial. In voting for the resolution it wished to recall certain facts. Finland had welcomed with satisfaction the Hoover plan, while urging a just application of its main principles. She had also recognised the appreciable advantages contained in the Soviet's delegations amendment, an essential part of which coincided with the provisions of the Hoover plan. Without joining any particular group or binding itself to adopt any particular solution, the Finnish delegation had thought that its best attitude should be one of abstention during the several votes which had taken place during the discussion of the resolution. It had not desired to vote against amendments which were reasonable and inspired by a sincere desire to achieve a reduction of armaments. Nor had it voted against texts which had been drawn up by the rapporteur with so much labour and in such a spirit of conciliation. The Finnish delegate had wished to explain his attitude in abstaining during the voting on questions of detail, and he now wished to say that he was ready to vote for the resolution, however restricted might be the preliminary result which it recorded.

General Laidoner (Estonia) associated himself with the observations of the Finnish delegate. The Estonian delegation would vote for the resolution for the reasons given by the Finnish delegate, although in its present form the resolution was far from giving Estonia complete satisfaction.

M. Feldmans (Latvia) said that his delegation would vote for the resolution for the same reasons as those put forward by the Finnish representative.

M. Lanskoronskis (Lithuania) said that Lithuania, of which the security would increase owing to qualitative disarmament, had naturally hoped for the immediate strengthening and increase of all the proposals contained in the resolution. He referred more particularly to the provisions covering air bombardment, chemical warfare and control. It was of the highest importance for the interests of small countries that the prohibition proclaimed should not remain a theory and should cover instruction and training in the use of these weapons. It would then be possible for them considerably to reduce their national expenditure. The Lithuanian delegation fully adhered to the statements of **M. Erich** and would vote for the resolution as a whole.

M. Saavedra-Aguero (Chile) had already stated that his delegation would accept the resolution as a whole. He wished, however, to make a reservation concerning paragraph 4 of Chapter II concerning Control, for he awaited a decision from his Government. The Chilean delegation noted with great satisfaction that the measures to be adopted in the second phase of the Conference's work were based on Article 8 of the Covenant, and that account would always be taken of the geographical situation and special conditions of each State.

M. Garay (Panama) said that owing to absence from Geneva he had not been able two weeks

previously to welcome the proposals of President Hoover which had been received with great satisfaction by the Government and people of the Republic of Panama.

Since the rapporteur himself had confessed that he was not entirely satisfied with the draft resolution a State fully disarmed could scarcely be expected to show enthusiasm for this document. Though the results of the Conference were of no direct interest to Panama, which had already reduced her armaments by 100 per cent, she nevertheless felt an indirect moral and humanitarian interest in co-operating with the other nations for the establishment of a just and peaceful state of affairs. Though the draft resolution might fall below the hopes prevalent at the outset of the Conference, it was none the less a preliminary constructive effort which would eventually be completed by other and wider measures. It was for this reason that Panama fully adhered to it.

M. Mikoff (Bulgaria) recalled that the Bulgarian delegation had from the outset urged that only a convention based on equality and guaranteeing security could ensure as complete a success as possible for the Conference. His delegation would not oppose the adoption of the text before the Commission. It could, however, only support it in so far as it constituted a contribution towards the establishment of a Convention which would prove acceptable to all States. This was for the future work of the Conference to achieve. **M. Mikoff** would there abstain from voting. The Bulgarian delegation would take a decision at a subsequent stage in regard to the principles underlying the proposals contained in the draft resolution when the General Commission had examined and settled the questions referred to in Chapter IV of that resolution.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

I. ADMISSION OF TURKEY TO THE LEAGUE

On July 1st, the following proposal was made to the Special League Assembly by the delegations therein mentioned.

"The delegations of the following countries: Albania, Australia, Austria, the British Empire, Bulgaria, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Persia, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Yugoslavia.

Noting that the Turkish Republic fulfils the general conditions laid down in Article 1 of the Covenant under which a State may become a Member of the League of Nations,

Propose that the Assembly shall invite the Turkish Republic to enter the League of Nations and give to the League the benefit of its valuable co-operation."

This proposal was submitted by **M. de Madariaga** (Spain) and seconded by **M. Michalopoulos** (Greece).

On July 6th the Assembly heard the Australian, Persian, Italian, German, United Kingdom, French, Japanese, Bulgarian, Polish, Indian, Irish Free State, Austrian, Canadian and Colombian delegations, all in favour of admitting Turkey to the League. The Assembly unanimously voted the following resolution:

"The Assembly,

"Recognising that the Turkish Republic fulfils the general conditions laid down in Article 1 of the Covenant for a State to become a Member of the League of Nations,

"Decides that the Turkish Republic shall be invited to enter the League of Nations and to give it the benefit of its valuable co-operation,

"And instructs the Secretary-General to take such action as may be necessary in pursuance of this resolution."

On July 9th, **Tevfik Rustu Bey**, the Turkish Foreign Minister, to whom the Assembly's invitation had been forwarded, addressed the following reply to the Secretary-General:

In reply to the invitation which you transmitted to me on behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to inform you that the Turkish Republic is prepared to become a Member of the League of Nations and that the obligations assumed by Turkey under the treaties concluded hitherto, including those concluded with States non-Members of the League of Nations, are in no way incompatible with the duties of a Member of the League of Nations. In this connection I would point out that all the treaties signed before the admission of Turkey have been concluded in the spirit of the Pact of Paris to which the majority of the Members of the League of Nations are also signatories.

In making this declaration it is my duty to add that Turkey is in a special position as a consequence of military obligations ensuing from the Conventions signed at Lausanne on July 24th, 1923.

Such being the case I desire to recall the terms of the note which was signed by the representatives of Belgium, France, the British Empire, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia on December 1st, 1925, and which was quoted by the German Government in its letter of February 8th, 1926, to the Secretary-General concerning the admission of Germany to the League of Nations. The last paragraph of that note read as follows:—

"The obligations resulting from the said article (article 16) on the Members of the League must be understood to mean that each State Member of the League is bound to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant and in resistance to any act of aggression to an extent which is compatible with its military situation and takes its geographical position into account."

On July 18th the Assembly, on the proposal of its Bureau, unanimously voted the following resolution:

"The Assembly,

"Whereas the Turkish Government has accepted the Assembly's invitation to it to become a Member of the League of Nations,

"And whereas it is established that the Turkish Republic fulfils the conditions laid down in Article 1 of the Covenant.

"Declares that the Turkish Republic is admitted to Membership of the League of Nations, and

"Invites its representatives to take part in the proceedings of the present session of the Assembly."

After a report by the Committee on Credentials, the Turkish representatives took their seats in the Assembly.

The President, M. Hymans, welcoming Turkey to the League, recalled that she had already co-operated in the work of the Commission of Inquiry for European Union and of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, and in the Conference itself. Noting that Turkey's membership would strengthen the authority of the League, he expressed his satisfaction at the assurance given by the Turkish Government that the treaties it had concluded did not embody obligations which were incompatible with those of a Member of the League.

The first Turkish delegate, Kemal Hüsnü Bey, thanked those delegations which, on July 1st and 6th, had expressed their friendly feelings towards his country. He added that the efforts of his country tended towards international co-operation and peace.

2. ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

The Special Committee appointed to study the existing system of elections to the Council met at Geneva on July 4th.* It elected as Chairman M. Pilotti (Italy) and as Vice-Chairman M. Carton de Wiart (Belgium). There were further present M. Mikoff (Bulgaria), Sir George Perley (Canada), M. Antonio Restrepo (Colombia), M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia), M. Massigli (France), M. Goeppert (Germany), Mr. E. H. Carr (Great Britain), M. Sawada (Japan), M. Raczynski (Poland), M. de Vasconcellos (Portugal), M. Palacios (Spain), and M. Westman (Sweden).

The question of the elections to the Council was raised in 1931 by the Portuguese delegation, which drew the Assembly's attention to the disadvantages of the existing system, which tended to prevent the admission to the Council of States not belonging to certain organised groups.

On the proposal of the British Government, the Assembly decided to appoint a special committee to study the problem and indicate any reform that might appear to it desirable.

In January, 1932, the Council invited the Argentine, Belgian, British, Bulgarian, Canadian, Colombian, Czechoslovak, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish Governments to appoint representatives to sit on the Special Committee.

The Committee decided to invite the Governments represented on it and the Governments of the other States Members to place their views before it and to adjourn to a later session the consideration of the question it had been appointed to study.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No 1, page 4.

IV.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

1 THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

The Council met on July 15th to consider various economic and financial questions and the report of the Economic Committee.

(a) *Preparation of a World Economic and Financial Conference.*

The Council considered a request forwarded by the Secretary-General of the Lausanne Conference (June 16th to July 9th, 1932).

This request was based on the following resolution:

The Conference, apart from the questions already dealt with, has further undertaken to decide upon "the measures necessary to solve the other economic and financial difficulties which are responsible for, and may prolong, the present world crisis"

The main questions of this order which demand examination are as follows:—

(a) *Financial Questions —*

Monetary and credit policy
Exchange difficulties
The level of prices
The movement of capital

(b) *Economic Questions —*

Improved conditions of production and trade interchanges, with particular attention to:—

Tariff policy
Prohibitions and restrictions of importation and exportation, quotas, and other barriers to trade
Producers' agreements

The Conference emphasises in particular the necessity of restoring currencies to a healthy basis, and of thereby making it possible to abolish measures of exchange control and to remove transfer difficulties, further, the Conference is impressed with the vital need of facilitating the revival of international trade

To achieve the above purposes—

The Conference decides to invite the League of Nations to convoke at a convenient date, and at a place to be fixed (not necessarily Geneva), a Conference on Monetary and Economic Questions

The Conference decides to entrust the preliminary examination of these complex questions, which are closely interdependent, to an authoritative committee of experts

The Conference, therefore, invites the Governments of Germany, Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan each to appoint as members of the Committee two experts one qualified to deal with economic questions the other qualified to deal with financial questions. The Committee would divide itself into two sub-committees according to the two branches of the subject. The two Sub-Committees would naturally have discretion to meet in joint session, whenever

necessary, with the object of ensuring the necessary co-ordination in their labours

The Conference further resolves to invite the Government of the United States of America to be represented on the committee on the same basis as the Governments of the States mentioned above

Finally, the Conference invites the Council of the League of Nations to nominate three persons qualified by their financial competence, and three persons qualified by their economic competence. It would be desirable that these persons should be nationals of countries other than those mentioned above. They might seek assistance from the Directors of the Economic and Financial Sections of the Secretariat of the League. The Conference similarly seeks the collaboration of the Bank for International Settlements, and decides to invite the latter to nominate two persons to participate in the work of the Sub Committee on Financial questions

When forwarding this resolution, the Secretary-General of the Lausanne Conference drew the League's attention to the invitation addressed to it to convene a Monetary and Economic Conference. He also emphasised the decision entrusting certain preliminary work to a Committee of qualified experts and asking the League to appoint three persons, nationals of States not yet represented on the Committee, qualified by their financial competence, and three others qualified by their economic competence.

The Council also received letters from the International Labour Office, stating that the Governing Body, in order to carry out the resolution of the International Labour Conference * on the economic crisis, had appointed M. Weigert (Germany) representative of the Government group, M. Oersted (Denmark) representative of the employers' group and M. Jouhaux (France) representative of the workers' group as members of a delegation to represent the Governing Body at the preparation of a world economic conference. Mr. Butler, Director of the International Labour Office, was accordingly invited to come to the Council table for the purpose of the discussion of the world conference.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) regretted that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and President of the Lausanne Conference, had not been able to be personally present at the meeting. He explained the scope of the Lausanne resolution concerning the world economic and financial conference, recalling that the question of convening such a conference had already been

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII, No. 5, page 154

discussed by the Council last May without a decision being taken. He proposed that the request of the Lausanne Conference should be complied with and, to this end, a Committee of the Council be set up.

After discussion, the Council unanimously adopted the following resolution :

The Council :

(1) Accedes to the request of the Lausanne Conference that a Conference on Monetary and Economic Questions should be convoked by the League of Nations.

(2) Appoints a Committee of the Council, which, without prejudice to the mission which has been entrusted under the Lausanne Agreement to the Commission referred to in the following paragraph, shall take such decisions of a practical character as may be necessary in connection with the convocation of the Conference. This Committee shall consist of representatives of those Governments Members of the Council which issued the invitations to the Conference of Lausanne, and of the members of the Council who are the rapporteurs on economic and financial questions.

The Committee of the Council shall have power, if and when it considers it desirable, to invite other States to appoint representatives to the Committee.

(3) (a) Confirms and adopts the decision of the Lausanne Conference that a Commission of Experts, constituted in accordance with Annex V. of the Lausanne Agreement of July 9th, 1932, should make a preliminary examination of the questions to be considered at the Conference. This Commission will keep in touch with the Committee of the Council, and the latter will in its turn report to the Council, when it thinks necessary to do so. The Council invites this Commission, in particular, to prepare a draft annotated agenda for the Conference.

(b) Requests the President of the Council Committee, after consultation with his colleagues, to nominate three persons qualified by their financial competence, and three persons qualified by their economic competence respectively, to serve on each of the Sub-Committees of the Commission mentioned in paragraph 3 (a) above. The services of the Directors of the Economic Relations Section and of the Financial Section and Economic Intelligence Service shall be at the disposal of the Commission.

(c) Invites the International Labour Office and the International Institute of Agriculture to place at the disposal of the Commission of Experts, in so far as the latter deems it necessary, the services of their technical organisations.

(d) The Committee of the Council should have the power, in consultation with the Commission of Experts, to add to the number of the Commission if this is judged necessary.

(4) Recommends to the Assembly that the necessary financial provision for the Conference be made.

The Council appointed the British representative as Chairman of the Committee constituted.

This Committee met on July 19th. It comprised representatives of Germany (rapporteur on economic questions), the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Japan, Norway (rapporteur on financial questions). In virtue of the power conferred upon it to invite other States to be represented, it requested its Chairman to invite the Belgian and American Governments. It decided to select later three financial and three economic experts.

(b) *The Financial Situation of Austria.*

The Council considered the work of the Mixed Committee of Government Experts and of the delegation of the Financial Committee.

M. Musy (Chairman of the Mixed Committee) and M. Pfügl (Austria) took part in the discussion.

The Norwegian representative, M. Irgens, presented a report, submitting for the approval of the Council a Protocol prepared by the Mixed Committee in accordance with the Council's decision of May 21st.*

The principal clauses of the Protocol may be summarised as follows :

The Governments which take part in the action in favour of Austria will help the Austrian Government to issue a loan up to a total of 300 million schillings, either by guaranteeing such a loan or by putting the money in some other manner at the disposal of the Austrian Government.

The loan will be concluded for 20 years and subject to the priorities attached to the Loan of 1923, the Relief Credits and the 1930 loan shall be secured by the receipts pledged for this 1923 loan. The conditions of the loan will be approved by the Committee or guarantor States. The monies received will for the most part be devoted to consolidating existing short term obligations.

The Austrian Government undertakes to take the necessary measures to re-establish and maintain budget equilibrium, and to carry out a programme of budgetary and financial reforms. This programme requires to be studied in its entirety, and I will therefore not attempt to summarise it here. I would draw your special attention, however, to Annexes I and II to the Protocol where it is set out. In addition the Austrian monetary policy will aim at the abolition as soon as possible, subject to necessary safeguards, of the difference between the internal and

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 153.

external value of the schilling, and, in consequence, at the progressive removal of the existing control over exchange transactions and the resulting obstructions to international trade.

It is provided that the Council of the League should nominate a representative of the League of Nations in Austria and designate an advisor to the Austrian National Bank. The proceeds of the loan will be utilised in agreement with them.

The Austrian Government will collaborate with the League representative and elaborate in agreement with him the detailed execution of the plan of reforms. The League representative will address every three months a report to the League.

The Protocol provides that the Council can terminate the posts of League representative and Commissioner when it considers that their functions are no longer required. The Council will have the right to re-establish either or both of these posts when it thinks it necessary so long as the 1923 loan and the loan to be issued under the new Protocol have not been entirely repaid.

The rapporteur added :

" If it is signed and ratified in time by a sufficient number of Governments, a substantial sum of foreign exchange will be placed at the disposal of Austria, thanks to which this country would be able to find the basis for a new equilibrium. It is to be hoped that this co-operative effort may allow the first step to be taken towards abolishing the existing hindrances to trade in Central Europe and that, as a similar effort to stabilise Austrian currency ten years ago was followed by general currency stabilisation elsewhere, so this action to-day may be followed by a recovery of trade throughout Europe, and the necessary measures to that effect."

M. Musy explained that the Mixed Committee had envisaged two solutions, one of a somewhat restricted character, which was to place forty or fifty million schillings at Austria's disposal, and the second the wider solution of an advance of 250 million or 300 million schillings. It had come to the conclusion that the latter more durable solution should be adopted.

M. Musy thought that the operation would be successful, as 250 million schillings had already been promised. He drew attention to certain clauses of the Protocol designed to ensure the best possible utilisation of the loan. In his opinion, if the latter were to facilitate

the service of Austria's foreign debt, it was of the utmost importance that it should also contribute to the removal of the serious anomalies affecting the Austrian currency system. To have lasting effect, this new financial assistance must, in the view of the Mixed Committee, be accompanied by certain real administrative and budgetary reforms. M. Musy expressed the hope that the financial operations would contribute to the durable solution of Austria's financial position and would facilitate the solution of a delicate and urgent problem: the monetary question.

M. Goeppert (Germany) said that his Government was not in a position to accede to the proposal before the Council and that it would abstain from taking part in the vote. This attitude, he said, was justified by the following considerations: the new loan to Austria was based upon Protocol I of 1922, signed on the occasion of the first League loan to Austria under the League's auspices. At that moment Germany had not been a Member of the League and she had taken no part in the preparation of the Protocol. Moreover, the Protocol was of a political character, and the German Government considered that an action designed to grant financial assistance to a state should not depend upon any political conditions whatever.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) expressed the hope that the Austrian Protocol, which was the first fruits of the spirit of Lausanne, would not only help Austria along the road to recovery, but would also prove of good augury for the future collaboration of Governments.

M. Massigli (France) stated that his Government, in expressing its willingness to help in the work of Austrian restoration, had always pointed out that, in its view, this problem was inseparable from that of the restoration of Central Europe as a whole. The satisfactory conclusion of the Austrian Protocol was, in the opinion of the French Government, the first step in this direction.

After M. de Madariaga (Spain) had expressed his good wishes for the success of the loan and had stated that his Government would study the Protocol in the hope that it could be associated with it, M. Pflügl thanked the Council on behalf of his Government. The real significance of the wise action of the Council, he said, went far beyond its concern with the interests of Austria alone. By beginning the reconstruction of Central and Eastern Europe by means of financial aid at its weakest point, the Council was inaugurating a new policy, a new order of things, which would remove the barriers between the peoples. The return to normal economic relations which must end the

present anarchy, would enable Austria, and also her neighbours, to benefit fully from the loan contemplated. It was only by adopting this wide view, on which the salvation of all depended, that the full importance of the first step which the Council was about to take, thanks to the spirit of international co-operation shown by the states which would participate in the loan, could really be appreciated.

The Austrian people had not hesitated to make the sacrifices asked of it. Budgetary reductions had continuously been made. To-day it was grateful to all whose valued friendship, wisdom, willingness and power had brought the necessary help.

The Protocol was unanimously adopted, with the abstention of the German representative. It was signed on the same day by the following States: Austria, France, the United Kingdom, Italy and Belgium. The four last countries undertook to participate in the loan to the following amounts: France 100 million schillings, the United Kingdom 100 millions, Italy 30 millions, Belgium 5 millions. Other promises of participation are expected.

The Council appointed M. Rost van Tonningen (Netherlands) as League representative in Austria, and M. Maurice Frere (Belgium) as Adviser to the Austrian National Bank.

(c) *Work of the Financial Committee.*

The Council considered the work of the forty-sixth session of the Financial Committee.

The rapporteur, M. Irgens (Norway), first explained that the Greek Government had desired to make a statement regarding the report, but that as the Greek Foreign Minister had not been able to reach Geneva in time, the question would have to be postponed until September.

As regards Bulgaria,* the rapporteur recalled that the Financial Committee had noted that the budget deficit had increased, and had emphasised the necessity of the fundamental reforms previously recommended. In view of the difficult position of the Treasury, the Committee had contemplated certain facilities to be granted to the Bulgarian Government (temporary suspension of the payment to the Bulgarian National Bank of the sinking fund annuity of the Bulgarian debt and of the minting profits).

As regards Hungary, the rapporteur pointed out that the Government had suspended the transfers in respect of the 1924 League loan and that the trustees had protested against a

state of things contrary to the previous 1924 Protocol. It nevertheless observed that the Financial Committee had stated that if the trustees were to retain all the profits of the assigned revenues the Hungarian Government would be deprived of funds, without which it might be difficult for it to exist. The real difficulties of agricultural countries at this time of year must be recognised, the rapporteur stated, but it was for the Council to draw the Hungarian Government's attention to the solemn character of its international obligations, and to urge it to make every effort to fulfil them and to resume the transfers which would be made possible by the seasonal trade improvement that might result from the next harvest.

In conclusion, the rapporteur quoted a passage of the report of the Financial Committee recommending as a remedy for the steady decline of Hungarian trade general measures of financial and economic reconstruction.

On the proposal of the rapporteur, the Council, after noting the report of the Financial Committee, approved the facilities to be granted to Bulgaria, while regretting that present difficulties necessitated certain modifications in the Protocol. It noted with regret the failures to meet international engagements, and asked the Financial Committee to follow the question and report thereon.

It made representations to the Hungarian Government regarding the urgent necessity of resuming, at the earliest possible moment, transfers on account of its foreign debt; it referred to the Preparatory Commission of the Economic and Financial Conference the general questions mentioned in the report of the Financial Committee which have not yet been settled.

M. Mikoff (Bulgaria) accepted the report, observing that his Government had not been represented at the last session of the Financial Committee. It intended to explain later to the Committee its reasons for considering that the temporary suspension of part of the transfer and of the services of the public debt was in accordance with the spirit of the Financial Committee's recommendations.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) observed that the picture presented in the report of the Financial Committee was a gloomy one: "no fair-minded man could fail to admit that the difficulties under which the individual States with which the report deals are due to a very great extent to causes outside their control." He, however, thought the Council could not but note that three of the States specially mentioned in the Financial Committee's report

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, page 125, and No. 6, page 192.

were in default to a greater or less degree as regards their foreign obligations and in particular of loans issued to them under the auspices of the League. He did not think it could be too often repeated that default on these lines was not only damaging to the credit of the defaulting state, but was bound to react to some degree upon the League itself.

Whatever the difficulties caused to individual States by the world crisis, each individual State must, none the less, bear some share of the responsibility, in so far as the policy which it pursued had a good or bad effect on its own credit.

He therefore proposed certain modifications in the draft resolution presented by the rapporteur and asked for the insertion of a paragraph by which the Council should emphasise its grave concern at the failure on the part of certain States to execute their international obligations and its hope that these States would make every effort to resume payment of their obligations as soon as possible.

He proposed the following addition :

"A failure to have due regard to their international financial obligations on the part of those countries which have benefited from loans issued under the League's auspices must have the gravest consequences not only on the credit of such countries, but also on the ability of the League to render collective assistance in the future."

M. Massigli (France) supported the amendments proposed by the British representative ; the Bulgarian representative confined himself

to stating that his Government would do all in its power to meet its foreign engagements in so far as its resources allowed.

The rapporteur having accepted the proposed amendments, the draft resolution was unanimously adopted by the Council.

The Council appointed M. Jean Watteau to succeed M. Charron as League Commissioner in Bulgaria, and M. Lewis Sheldon as trustee for the Bulgarian 7 per cent. 1926 Loan and the Bulgarian 7½ per cent. 1928 Loan.

2. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

The Opium Commission of the Health Organisation.

The Commission of pharmacological experts presided over by Professor L. van Itallie, held its second session at The Hague from July 11th to July 14th, 1932.†

At this session the Commission continued its studies concerning the standardisation of methods of measuring the morphine content of various opium preparations, a question referred to it by the Health Committee in 1931.

Before agreeing upon a standard method, the experts thought it necessary to investigate a new method worked out by Professor Eder (Zürich) and a method based upon the British Pharmacopœia recommended by Professor van Itallie.

The experts drew up a plan of research concerning the standardisation of methods of measuring the cocaine content of coca leaves. This plan will be submitted to the Health Committee at its next session.

V.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

From July 12th to July 23rd the League's attention was more especially engaged by the work of intellectual co-operation.

1. EDUCATION.

(a) Education of Young People.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation noted the work of the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Education of Youth in the Aims of the League, and reviewed the work done during the year by the Educational Information Centres of Geneva and Paris.*

1. The Geneva Centre approached States on the subject of the instruction concerning the League given in teachers' training colleges. It made a similar inquiry among institutes for the study of political science. Having been instructed to collect material on the production of an instructive film concerning the League,*

it studied how to give effect to this scheme, with the co-operation of competent circles. On being informed of this work, the Committee expressed the opinion that the Secretariat of the Organisation, in agreement with the Rome Cinematographic Institute and the Information Section, should continue inquiries on the subject and collect any suggestions calculated to promote the execution of the scheme. It emphasised the importance it attached to films on topical subjects and, more particularly, to the part which the cinematograph might play in furthering mutual understanding between the peoples.

2. The Paris Educational Information Centre forwarded the results of its inquiries regarding the questions referred to it : revision of school

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 7, page 177.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 5, page 129, and No. 10, page 289.

books; educational aspect of broadcasting; centre of educational information; adult education; interchanges and study tours for young people.

(a) The question of the *revision of school books* was discussed at length. After considering a report from the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and the conclusions of the Committee of Experts which met in Paris in February, 1932,* the Committee endorsed the opinion of the experts that the 1925 Assembly resolution might be amended and defined. This resolution set forth the procedure to be adopted and defined the action of national committees with a view to the improvement of school books and the elimination of passages detrimental to mutual international understanding.

According to the existing procedure, a national committee on intellectual co-operation which considers that a foreign text-book concerning its country and intended to be used in teaching should be modified applies to the national committee of the country concerned for the desired modification. The latter, if it does not consider such modification necessary, is not compelled to give an explanation.

With the proposed new system, requests for revision are subject to appeal. Not only would the International Committee be informed of the correspondence exchanged, but it might also be requested to take conciliatory action.

The Committee further recommended that an inquiry should be made with regard to the psychological effects of school books on the mind of the child. It expressed the opinion that it would be well to encourage the preparation of school and reading books in a spirit of international rapprochement.

(b) The question of *educational broadcasting* was examined by the Committee from the point of view of education in general, and from that of the promotion of an international spirit.

As regards the first point, it considered that the Institute should continue its inquiry. For the second, it expressed the view that the Institute should summon a committee of experts which would define the future action, establish a plan of work, and seek means of encouraging relations between various broadcasting agencies and, if possible, of concluding an international agreement on the subject.

On this occasion, the Committee considered the results of educational broadcasting in Europe and America. It was also informed of the experiment made by the Secretariat to

spread knowledge of the League by broadcasting and the scheme for using the Prangins Station—the League's property—for broadcasting a weekly bulletin on the work of the League. This bulletin would be addressed, more especially, to overseas countries—the Far East, North and South America.

(c) *Educational Information Centres.* Desiring to ensure co-ordination between the work of the educational information centres and the primary education authorities, the Committee expressed itself in favour of the establishment of regular contact through an international committee, which would encourage continuous co-operation between the various countries as regards primary and secondary education.

(d) The Committee considered the existing methods and principles governing *interchanges and study tours for young people*, and expressed the desire that national offices or co-ordination centres should be set up to collect information on all questions concerning the organisation of journeys and the material facilities that could be obtained.

B. The question of *adult education* was also considered. The Committee approved the work already done in this field by the Institute and the International Labour Office. It asked that systematic action on similar lines should be developed, both in popular and professional circles. This action would be directed towards the utilisation of workers' spare time, which is constantly increasing, owing to unemployment, with a view to completing their education and intensifying their general culture.†

C. *Educational Reform in China.* The Committee was informed of the results of the mission sent by the League to China, at the request of the Nanking Government, to assist the latter in improving its educational system and to facilitate exchanges between Chinese intellectual centres and those of other countries.‡

It heard M. Carl Becker, Professor at Berlin University and former Prussian Minister of Education, M. Langevin, Professor at the *Collège de France*, and M. Sardi, representing the International Educational Cinematographic Institute, who formed part of the League mission.

M. Becker described the work done by the experts. They had travelled through the districts of Tien-Tsin and Peking, the Cheliang and Kiang-Su Provinces, established relations with school and administrative authorities and

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 7, page 182.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, page 130.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 2, page 40.

the directors of universities, primary and secondary schools; studied technical education in the schools which had already been organised; noted the arrangements made in important centres as regards adult education; passed a month at Nanking in contact with the Ministry of Education and the Sub-Committee of the Economic Council dealing with questions of education.

The advice given by the mission concerned, in the first place, improvement or administrative simplification at all stages. It emphasised the primary necessity of having qualified teaching staffs; the training of teachers, not only for higher education, but still more for secondary and primary schools and scientific branches; the establishment of a statute for professors and teachers which would afford them stable situations. The mission also dealt with the regrouping of the universities and the organisation of secondary education, in particular technical education and of primary and adult education.

Further, one of the experts appointed on the proposal of the International Cinematographic Institute studied the possibility of producing educational films in China. At the suggestion of the Chinese authorities, he examined the question from the threefold viewpoint of fresh facilities for education (documentary films, films on vocational training, hygiene, agriculture, scientific training, etc.); co-operation in the work of reconstruction undertaken in China by making it known in the country itself; means of increasing the interest of other nations in China.

To facilitate the execution of the measures recommended the Chinese Government has decided to send to Europe a similar mission of educationists; it wishes them to visit certain selected countries and to study their administrative system and principal university and school centres from the point of view of public education. This mission will be composed of administrators and will leave next autumn.

Meanwhile, the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation has collected for the mission material which will enable it to benefit from its visit to Europe and, on its return to China, to make use of its experience. The mission will also take back to China a collection of standard school books.

M. Langevin emphasised that the mission had been unanimous in its conclusions, despite the fact that it was composed of four educationists of different nationalities, with different training and belonging to university administrations which are not formed on identical lines.

M. Langevin spoke, in particular, of scientific instruction.

M. Sardi explained that he had shown ample cinematographic material to Chinese educationists in the more important centres, and had given explanatory lectures. He had studied with the Chinese authorities the conditions in which instructive films could be established and used in China in the light of the experience gained in Europe.

2. SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS.

The Committee paid special attention to the relations between the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and the international scientific organisations. It took note of the fact that, during the year, the International Institute had approached the International Council of Scientific Unions. With a view to close co-operation between the two organisations it heard a delegation appointed by the Executive Committee of the International Research Council and composed of Sir Henry Lyons, Secretary-General, M. Gérard and M. Magrini.

Desiring to avoid duplication and facilitate the co-ordination of scientific work, the Committee adopted the following principles:

1. Any question of scientific organisation concerning exact and natural science and its application submitted to the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation or to the International Council of the Scientific Unions shall form the object of an exchange of views between the two organisations.

2. If they decide to take up the matter, the procedure (e.g., collection of suitable material, convocation of a Committee of experts or of any other means likely to further the solution of the problem) will be established by joint agreement between them.

The executive organs of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation may be entrusted with the executive measures to be taken in agreement with the Secretariat-General of the International Council of Scientific Unions.

The Committee was informed of the work of its Committee for Co-operation between scientific museums which held its first meeting at Geneva on July 16th. The discussions were attended by Sir John Flett, Director of the British Museum of Practical Geology; Professor Lemoine, Director of the National Natural History Museum, Paris; Dr. Wilhelm Unverzagt, Director of the Museum for Pre-Historic Study, Berlin, and were presided over by Professor Avinoff, Director of the Carnegie Museum, Pittsburg. It concerned the necessity

and possibility of furthering co-operation between scientific museums with a view to determining the exact points on which such co-operation would be desirable, in particular by means of the creation of a reference centre, the study of teaching and exchange methods, and the co-ordination of existing national centres; the development of points of contact between general and specialised scientific museums, etc.; all these questions are intended to assist not only specialists, but also students and the wider public.

3. LITERARY AND ARTISTIC QUESTIONS.

1. *Co-operation of Intellectual Circles in International Work.* The Committee endorsed the views of the Arts and Letters Committee, which had recommended correspondence and conversations between distinguished authorities of the intellectual world. This correspondence and these conversations, designed for regular publication, should bear upon the questions most suitable to serve the joint interests of the intellectual world and the League of Nations. The first of these conversations was devoted to Goethe, the man, the poet and his work. The second will bear upon the destiny and future of Europe.

The first two subjects chosen for correspondence are: (1) means of ensuring the representation of intellectual circles in social, economic and political activities; (2) the difference between the Latin and Nordic mentality.

2. The Committee noted with satisfaction that the *International Museums Office* had achieved positive results.* It emphasised the special importance of the work of the Athens Conference for the protection and preservation of artistic and historical monuments.

Desiring to strengthen the co-operation between the national fine arts administrations, the Committee recommended that States, acting in the spirit of the Covenant, should lend each other increased co-operation with a view to ensuring the preservation of artistic monuments and should invite educationists to inculcate the respect of monuments into children and young people.

The Committee learned with regret that the Berne Exhibition of Popular Arts had been postponed till 1939.

4. MORAL DISARMAMENT.

The Committee was informed of the work of the Moral Disarmament Committee of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of

Armaments.† It heard M. Perrier, Chairman of this Committee, who gave explanations regarding the present progress of the work. The members of the Committee emphasised that it had invariably regarded the tasks entrusted to it, even those of a most technical character, as having as their object spiritual rapprochement and mutual understanding between the peoples.

5. NATIONAL COMMITTEES ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

The Committee recalled the very important rôle of the national committees on intellectual co-operation, and expressed its intention of organising a conference of these bodies as soon as circumstances permitted.

Meanwhile, it expressed the view that, as far as possible, it would be desirable to enable the chairmen and secretaries of the national committees to take part in the work of the International Committee, as well as in the work of committees, where such co-operation appears desirable.

It instructed the Secretariat to forward to the national committees the documents of the Disarmament Conference concerning moral disarmament and to request them to study in what way they would be able to co-operate in the work in their own countries.

6. WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CINEMATOGRAPHIC INSTITUTE IN ROME.

This work has developed favourably and has led to the creation of national committees in a great number of countries. These committees act to some extent as the correspondents of the Institute. The Institute has co-operated in the inquiry undertaken with a view to promoting the use of the cinematograph for the instruction of young people in the aims of the League. It has included in its programme various questions of immediate interest, such as copyright of works falling within the public domain; cinematographic archives, preservation of films of a historic character, preparation of international catalogues of films with an educational value.

As regards the abolition of customs duties on educational films,‡ the Institute amended its draft convention in the light of observations presented by Governments. To speed up its entry into force without summoning a diplomatic conference, the Institute in agreement with the League Economic Committee, prepared a draft protocol for submission to the

† See Chapter on the Conference.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. X., No. 6, page 118, and No. 9, page 208.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, page 130.

next Assembly, on which occasion it will eventually be opened for signature.

7. WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

In closing its work, the Committee emphasised its appreciation of the work of the Institute during the past year in all fields of its activity. It considered that works such as those published by the Institute on Popular Arts, the Goethe Centenary, the Milan Conference, and those about to be published on the rôle of broadcasting from an international educational point of view, and the Chinese educational reform constitute an important contribution to the work of the League.

* * *

The following took part in the work :

Professor Gilbert Murray, Professor of Greek at Oxford University ;

M. S. Restrepo (replacing M. Sanin Cano), writer, journalist, Colombian *Chargé d'Affaires* at Stockholm ;

M. José Castillejo, Professor of the Institutions of Roman Law at the University of Madrid ;

Mme. Curie-Sklodowska (Vice-Chairman), Professor of Physics at Paris University ;

M. J. Destrée (Vice-Chairman), Deputy, former Minister for Sciences and Arts ;

Dr. H. A. Krüss, Director-General of the Prussian State Library, Berlin ;

M. Gösta S. Forsell, Professor of Radiology at the University of Stockholm, Member of the Swedish Academy of Science ;

Mr. Earle B. Babcock, Assistant Director of the European Centre of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Paris ;

M. Gallie (replacing M. Painlevé), Secretary-General of the International Confederation of Intellectual Workers ;

M. Sarva Palli Radhakrishnan, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Calcutta ;

M. G. de Reynold, Professor at Berne University, Chairman of the Swiss Committee on Intellectual Co-operation ;

M. Alfredo Rocco, Professor of the Faculty of Political Sciences at Rome University ;

M. Heinrich von Srbik, Professor of History at the University of Vienna ;

M. Joseph Susta, Professor of General History at Charles University, Prague, former Minister of Education ;

M. Aikitu Tanakadate, Professor Emeritus at the Imperial University of Tokio, Member of the Imperial Academy of Science, Tokio, and its representative in the House of Peers ;

M. C. Opreescu (replacing M. Titulesco), Professor at Bucarest University ;

M. Hoschien Tchen (replacing M. Wu-Shi-Fee), Professor at the Franco-Chinese University, Peking, special correspondent of the National Academy of Peking, former member of the Government and Commissioner of Public Instruction at Kiang-Su ;

M. Dufour-Feronce, Under Secretary-General of the League of Nations and Director of the Section for International Bureaux and Intellectual Co-operation ;

M. Bonnet, Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation ;

M. F. Maurette, Head of the Research Division of the International Labour Office ;

The following took part in the work of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Instruction of Youth :

Professor Gilbert Murray ;

M. Destrée ;

M. Ivan Djaya, Professor at Belgrade University ;

M. Gallavresi, Professor of History at Milan University ;

M. Peter Munch, Foreign Minister of Denmark ;

M. Rosset, Director of Primary Education at the French Ministry of Education ;

M. W. Schellberg, Councillor at the Prussian Ministry of Education ;

M. A. Zimmern, Professor of International Relations at Oxford ;

Miss Helen Clarkson-Miller, Chairman of the Education Committee of the League of Nations Association of the U.S.A.

Mme. Dreyfus-Barney, Vice-Chairman of the Peace Section of the International Council of Women.

VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS. MANDATES.

REQUEST OF IRAQ FOR ADMISSION TO THE LEAGUE.

Iraq's formal request for admission to the League of Nations, together with an explanatory memorandum and a copy of the Declaration of Guarantees furnished to the Council was

forwarded to the Secretary-General by the British Government.*

The British Government asked that this request should be placed on the agenda of the next Assembly and, meanwhile, be brought to the notice of States Members of the League.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 158.

VII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. STATEMENTS OF THE BRITISH AND FRENCH GOVERNMENTS.

At the Council meeting of July 15th the British representative, Sir John Simon, made the following statement:

"Before dealing with the resolution of the Lausanne Conference with regard to the convening of a world economic and financial conference, I would ask leave to make a very short statement on another matter which has recently arisen and which, though it has no part in the agreements reached at the Lausanne Conference, is none the less an outcome of it. The announcement was made on Wednesday in the British House of Commons of an invitation, in which the United Kingdom and French Governments have taken the lead, to adopt the method of candid and open discussion of any questions similar in origin to that which has now been so happily settled at Lausanne which may affect the European régime. The declaration at the same time expressed the intention to work, together with all other delegations from every part of the world, for a solution of the disarmament question which would be beneficial and equitable for all Powers concerned and to co-operate in the careful and practical preparation of the World Economic Conference.

"As regards the first feature of this declaration, it has been made entirely plain that the object is to encourage, in case questions of difficulty arise in the future within the European continent, a candid exchange of views and the declaration, therefore, has no reference to extra-European matters. It is a resolve to apply the open methods, which succeeded in producing at Lausanne agreement about reparations, to any corresponding difficulties between European nations in the future. I am very glad to say that the Italian and Belgian Governments have already expressed their adherence to this declaration, and I wish to make it plain to the Council of the League that the invitation is not limited to the inviting Powers at Lausanne, but is open for the adherence of other European States.

"There is one other feature of the matter which I wish to emphasise. Those who are responsible for making this declaration and inviting adherence to it are doing so in loyalty to the prescriptions laid down in the preamble of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in the hope that this may contribute to the influence and work of the League. There is, of course, no question of creating any new organisation. On the contrary, the declaration is designed to sustain the sort of work which is undertaken by the European Committee of the League. That Committee was one of the last contributions of M. Briand to League work, and I feel sure that he would have given his full approval to our effort. The declaration is a statement of the method of frank communication and will, we hope and believe, strengthen both the League spirit and the League influence. We trust that it will promote confidence and appeasement throughout Europe, and I report, Sir, the effort

to our colleagues here in order that there may be full appreciation of our purpose to promote concord between members of the European family."

M. Massigli (France) associated himself with Sir John Simon's words and comments.

2. APPEAL FROM THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The Special Assembly met on July 1st to examine proposals presented by its Special Committee for the extension of the time limit fixed in Article 12 of the Covenant.*

In the course of the debate, the President, M. Hymans, emphasised the exceptional character of the circumstances which rendered this extension necessary, and, at the same time, made it possible to state that the extension did not constitute a precedent.

The Chinese representative, M. Yen, declared that his Government would agree to the proposal, but explained why he considered that the extension was a serious matter both for China and for the League. If the authors of the Covenant had provided for a time limit of six months, it was in order to avoid the prolongation of a dispute and also to prevent a party from creating a situation and thus virtually imposing its own solution upon the world. In the present case, although Article 15 of the Covenant had been invoked only in February, 1932, the dispute had actually been brought before the League in September, 1931, under Article 11. During the first two months, China had abstained from invoking Article 15 and had made a supreme effort to bring about a solution by conciliatory means, in accordance with advice received from various quarters. It was not right that China should now be made to suffer for her patience and spirit of conciliation.

Also, the delay in the submission of the report of the Commission of Inquiry was not China's fault. In September, the Chinese Government had requested that a Commission should be sent to Manchuria; Japan had opposed these measures. When, on December 10th, it had been decided to take this step, China had asked that the Commission should leave at once. The Commission did not leave before the end of January, arriving in Mukden only on April 21st. In these circumstances, China was entitled to ask that the new delay should be cut down to an absolute minimum.

For various reasons, this further delay was a serious matter. Japan was making use of

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 6, page 198.

the illegal Manchu organisation, and was destroying the integrity of the Chinese Maritime Customs, the postal administration and the gabelle service. The situation had also grown worse from the military point of view. China estimated the Japanese forces in Manchuria at sixty thousand men; cavalry reinforcements and other units had recently been despatched there. Moreover, three provinces, the granary of China, would have this year to import large quantities of food. The farmers and the peasants had not cultivated the land. The further delay in the settlement of the conflict could but increase the damage inflicted upon the Chinese people and favour the attempt of those who, by force, were endeavouring to create a *fait accompli*. For this reason the Chinese Government had clearly expressed the opinion that, by adopting a prolongation of six months, the Assembly should not tolerate the further aggravation of the situation during the period.

M. Sandler (Sweden) said that one important reason of the difficulties of the present moment was to be sought in circumstances for which the League was itself responsible. From the very beginning the Sino-Japanese dispute should have been dealt with firmly and speedily. At the present moment the Assembly had no choice in the matter and the Swedish delegation would agree to the proposal for a prolongation of the time limit, subject to certain observations.

In the first place, the time limit must not be prolonged beyond what was strictly necessary; the task of the Commission of Inquiry was to furnish the League authorities with complete information which would enable them to take decisions with a full knowledge of facts. It was for the Assembly itself to take the steps contemplated under Article 15 of the Covenant and to draw up the terms for the settlement of the dispute. The Swedish delegate hoped that the Council would see that the Assembly should have the information as soon as possible.

Secondly, the Swedish delegate recalled the terms of the Assembly resolution of March 11th, 1932, which defined the attitude not only of the parties to the dispute but also of all the Members of the League. In this resolution it had been stipulated that it was contrary to the spirit of the Covenant that the settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute should be sought under the stress of military pressure on the part of either party; the Assembly had further proclaimed that it was incumbent upon the Members of the League not to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement which may be

brought about by means contrary to the Covenant or the Paris Pact.

M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia) recalled that, at earlier meetings, Dr. Benes had urged that the Assembly should act strictly in conformity with the provisions of the Covenant and in the spirit of the Covenant, using all its influence so that the parties to the dispute might remain within the law and abstain from any measures of coercion and violence. If the Czechoslovak delegation approved to-day the proposal submitted to the Assembly it was only in the firm hope that, during the period of prolongation no act would be committed that might further aggravate the situation or create a position likely to impede pacific settlement. In no case was it possible to countenance the infringement of previous resolutions of the Assembly.

The Mexican delegate, M. Martinez de Alva, on behalf of his country, made the express reservation, which already figures in the proposal, namely, that the acceptance of the extension of the time limit should not be regarded as a precedent. In view of the vast moral interests at stake, he desired to add that personally he sincerely hoped that this reservation would be taken into consideration by later sessions of the Assembly.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) associated himself with the statements of the three preceding speakers. The League would later have to safeguard itself against the inferences that might be drawn from the step which it was now taking. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the League was, for the first time, confronted with a case which required the application of provisions of the Covenant under which the Assembly had to intervene in a dispute. It was only natural that some inexperience had been shown in dealing with it. The League had made mistakes in procedure, rather than committed serious errors; one of these mistakes—perhaps an unavoidable one—had been the slowness with which the Commission of Inquiry had been constituted and despatched to the Far East. The proposal of the Special Committee was then adopted.

After the vote, the President stated that he wished to emphasise a very important point. The Assembly had agreed to the extension of the time limit because it considered that the League must continue its efforts with a view to a satisfactory settlement of the dispute in the best possible conditions. The parties, both Members of the League, must do their utmost to realise conditions which would further the settlement. Recalling that, in his letter of June 24th to the Chinese and Japanese repre-

sentatives he had alluded to the undertaking given by both parties before the Council not to aggravate the situation, and also to the Assembly resolution of March 11th. The President added :

"Such being the case, the decision just taken by the Assembly authorises me to declare that the parties must abstain from any action that might compromise the success of the work of the Commission of Inquiry or of any efforts the League may make with a view to a settlement.

I would remind you also that on March 11th the Assembly proclaimed 'that it is incumbent upon the Members of the League of Nations not to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League of Nations or the Pact of Paris.' "

In a series of communications to the Special

Assembly the Chinese Government states that the Manchus had taken possession of the postal service in Manchuria at the instigation of the Japanese authorities. In these circumstances, in accordance with the Convention of the Postal Union, the whole postal service in Manchuria was suspended for the moment and all European or American mail would be despatched via the Suez Canal or the Pacific Ocean.

The Chinese Government requested that the members of the Postal Union should despatch their Chinese mail by the same channels.

On July 20th the Chinese Government protested against the bombardment of Chaoyang, in the Province of Jehol, from the air.

* * *

The Commission of Inquiry presided over by Lord Lytton, which left for Japan at the beginning of the month, returned to Peking at the end of July.

VIII.—BUDGETARY AND FINANCIAL QUESTIONS.

THE SUPERVISORY COMMISSION.

The Supervisory Commission met at Geneva from July 12th to July 14th under the chairmanship of M. Osusky to consider the results

of the inquiry made by Sir Malcolm Ramsay in regard to the points referred to the Supervisory Commission by the Council resolution of May 21st.

IX.—LEAGUE PUBLICATIONS.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS 1930.

The balances of payments of the main creditor and debtor countries in recent years afford ample evidence of disturbances in international business transactions, and particularly in capital movements between countries. The direction of these movements has indeed been completely reversed : some countries which are normally lending countries, for example, France and the United Kingdom, have begun to import capital on a large scale, while the country which since the war has borrowed most—Germany—has become a capital exporter. A similar reversal had taken place in the case of a number of smaller countries. The supply of large French balances of short-term capital which previously, directly or through intermediaries, flowed to debtor countries is no longer available, and, instead, France has drawn heavily upon her short-term assets abroad—a fact which, at least temporarily, has put the United Kingdom and the United States, which although creditors on long-term are debtors on short-term, in a position similar to that of debtor countries.

There has also been a rush for the liquidation of other short-term obligations, and the wish to avoid taxation or the fear of currency inflation has caused a heavy flight of capital from the poor to the rich countries.

This reversal of capital movements is reflected in a corresponding reversal of the trade balance of numerous countries, and in a heavy flow of gold towards a few countries which are considered to afford the best security for short-term investment, such as France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Switzerland. On the whole, the security of the investment has become a more important factor than the yield ; while in normal times the movement of capital from country to country is largely determined by relative interest rates, there has recently been a marked tendency for capital to move from countries where interest rates are high to countries where they are low.

Conditions in the poor countries have, of course, been adversely affected by the reversal of capital movements. Not only had these countries for a number of years adapted their economic life to a steady inflow of foreign

capital, the cessation of which has directly affected the conditions of their domestic production and consumption, but the majority of the countries in question, which produce mainly foodstuffs and raw materials, are suffering in addition from the increase in the burden of their foreign debt and the rapid deterioration

of their terms of trade, resulting from the heavy fall in the prices of their main export articles.

That a close relation exists between the terms of trade of these countries and the volume of capital exports from the big creditor countries is shown by graphs covering the period 1921-1931.

X.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

August 15th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

August 22nd.—Committee of Experts on Slavery, Geneva.

August 27th.—Committee of Experts on the Utilisation of the Port of Danzig.

September 1st.—Reporting Committee on Questions relating to Venereal Diseases, Geneva.

September 7th.—Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment, Geneva.

September 19th.—Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

September 19th.—Financial Committee, Geneva.

September 21st.—Bureau of the Disarmament Conference, Geneva.

September 23rd.—Sixty-eighth session of the Council, Geneva.

September 26th.—Thirteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva.

September 30th.—Reporting Committee on the Health of the Child of School Age, Geneva.

October 7th.—Health Committee, Geneva.

October 10th.—Economic Committee, Geneva.

October 11th.—Twelfth session of the Permanent Executive Committee of the International Cinematographic Institute, Rome.

October 12th.—Fifth session of the Governing Body of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute, Rome.

November 3rd.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.



THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

1. INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE OF MEMEL.

Following upon the judgment whereby it affirmed its compétence to deal with points 5 and 6 of the application in the case concerning the interpretation of the Statute of Memel (brought by the British, French, Italian and Japanese Governments against the Lithuanian Government), the Court received from the Lithuanian Government a supplementary counter-case dealing with these points. It also held a series of hearings on July 11th, 12th and 13th at which the representatives of the parties argued these points.

At the conclusion of these arguments, the hearings were declared closed by the President, who, however, in so doing, reserved the Court's right, should it see fit, to call for further information from the parties' representatives. The Court is now deliberating upon its judgment.

2. PRINCE OF PLESS ADMINISTRATION.

On July 11th, at the request of the German Government which by its application of May 18th, 1932, had submitted to the Court the suit concerning the Prince of Pless Administration, the Court extended by one week the times for the submission by the parties of the documents of the written proceedings in this case, so that the case will be ready for hearing as from November 7th, 1932.

On July 22nd, the date fixed by the Court's Order, the German Government filed its case with the Registry of the Court.

3. STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND.

On July 22nd, 1932, the date fixed for this purpose by the order of court of June 18th, 1932, extending the time limits, the Danish Government filed its written reply in the case concerning the legal status of certain parts of Eastern Greenland.

4. CERTAIN JUDGMENTS GIVEN BY THE HUNGARY-CZECHOSLOVAK MIXED ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL.

By letters dated Prague, July 7th and 20th, 1932, M. Koukal, Agent-General of the Czechoslovak Government before the Mixed Arbitral Tribunals, sent to the Registry a first application from his Government concerning two judgments given on December 21st, 1931, by

the Hungary-Czechoslovak Mixed Arbitral Tribunal in cases No. 321 (Alexandre Semsey and Others *v.* the State of Czechoslovakia) and No. 752 (Wilhelm Fodor *v.* the State of Czechoslovakia) and a second application concerning a judgment given by the same tribunal on April 13th, 1932, in case No. 127 (Ungarische Hanf und Flachsindustrie *v.* (1) the State of Czechoslovakia and (2) the Flax Spinners Association).

These applications are brought under the agreement for the settlement of questions relating to the agrarian reforms and Mixed Arbitral Tribunals between Hungary and Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Yugoslavia, signed at Paris on April 28th, 1930. It is laid down in Art. X of this agreement that there shall be a right of appeal to the Court from judgments on questions of jurisdiction or merits given by the Mixed Arbitral Tribunals above mentioned (save for certain exceptions), without any special agreement.

By orders dated July 18th and 28th the Court, without prejudice to the question whether it has jurisdiction or that of the admissibility of the application, has fixed as follows the time limits for the filing by the parties of the first written documents in these two suits:

For the case of the Czechoslovak Government, September 9th, 1932.

For the Counter-case of the Hungarian Government, October 28th, 1932.

5. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN TERRITORIES IN SOUTH-EAST GREENLAND.

On July 18th, 1932, the Court received two applications instituting proceedings concerning the legal status of South-east Greenland: one from the Norwegian Government and the other from the Danish Government. Both these applications invoke the declarations of Norway and Denmark adhering to the Optional Clause of the Court Statute.

The applications arise out of the Norwegian Government's declaration of July 12th, 1932, placing certain portions of the territory of South-east Greenland under its sovereignty.

According to the Norwegian application, this step was taken for the protection of Norwegian interests in a territory which Norway holds to be *terra nullius*. The Danish Government, however, has refused to recognise the legal validity of the occupation effected by Norway. This is the dispute which the Norwegian Government submits to the Court. Further, the

* This chapter has been compiled on the basis of material furnished by the Registry of the Court.

Norwegian Government, fearing that incidents might occur, seeing that the Danish Government had already intimated that a Danish expedition which was to visit this territory was invested with police powers not only in respect of Danish nationals but also of Norwegian nationals, asks the Court forthwith to order the Danish Government, as an interim measure of protection, to abstain from any coercive measures directed against Norwegian nationals in the said territory.

The other application—that of the Danish Government—asks the Court to declare the recent Norwegian occupation of South-east Greenland illegal. It claims that the whole of Greenland is completely under Danish sovereignty and that the legal situation has been duly recognised by Norway. The application also requests the Court to decide that the Norwegian Government shall bear the costs incurred by the Danish Government in this new case. The latter Government, moreover, reserves the right to ask the Court to decide as to the nature of the reparation due to the Danish Government for the above-mentioned violations by the Norwegian Government of the existing legal status.

When filing the application, the Norwegian Government's Agent had asked the Court to defer its decision upon the request for interim measures of protection should the Danish Government inform the Court that it would not adopt coercive measures.

On being informed of the foregoing, the Danish Government sent to the Court on July 22nd a note replying to the Norwegian Agent's communication. In this note the Danish Government asks the Court *inter alia* to reject the Norwegian request for interim measures as purposeless and groundless.

It further recalled that in its own application it had reserved the right to ask for interim measures of protection and added that what it had in mind was the possibility of Norwegians acting in a manner prejudicial to the protection of the Eskimos living in the territory covered by the latest declaration of occupation, or the possibility of other incidents arising.

The contents of this note were at once communicated to the Norwegian Agent. They gave rise to no further steps on the part of the Norwegian Government.

Furthermore, the Danish Government has not up to the present submitted any application based upon its reservation.

The Danish and Norwegian Governments respectively appointed, under Article 31, para. 3 of the Statute, as judges *ad hoc* to sit on the

Court in the cases thus instituted: M. Zahle, Danish Minister at Berlin; and M. Vogt, Norwegian Minister in London. MM. Zahle and Vogt had previously been appointed judges *ad hoc* in the Eastern Greenland case.

Applying Article 57 of the Rules, which provides that the Court shall only indicate interim measures of protection after giving the parties an opportunity of being heard, the Permanent Court of International Justice held two hearings on July 28th to deal with the application for interim measures of protection submitted in this case by the Norwegian Government.

At these hearings the parties were represented as follows:—

For the Norwegian Government:

Agent, M. Bull, Norwegian Chargé d'Affaires at The Hague; Agents and Advocates, MM. Arne Sunde, Advocate at the Supreme Court of Norway, former Minister of Justice, and Per Rygh, Advocate at the Supreme Court; Counsel and Advocate, M. Gilbert-Charles Gidel, Professor at the Faculty of Law, Paris University, and at the Ecole libre des Sciences politiques; expert, M. Adolf Hoel, Supplementary Professor at the University of Oslo.

For the Danish Government:

Agent, M. Scavenius, Danish Minister at The Hague; Agent, Counsel and Advocate, M. K. Steglich-Petersen, Advocate at the Supreme Court of Denmark; Counsel and Advocate, M. Gustav Rasmussen, Doctor of Law, of the Danish Foreign Ministry.

At the morning hearing, the President, after he had made the usual observations and had taken note of the solemn declarations made by MM. Vogt and Zahle prior to their installation as judges *ad hoc*, called upon the representatives of the Norwegian Government.

On behalf of that Government, M. Rygh presented the facts which had given rise to the request for interim measures of protection. M. Sunde then expounded the law, concluding with the following declaration:

"From the standpoint of Norway any exercise of sovereignty by Denmark in the territory occupied by Norway is illegal since the territory is now Norwegian. Nevertheless Norway considers that the two parties, pending the Court's decision, should mutually respect each other's views. Norway, animated by the respect due to the Court, declares that she for her part is quite ready to observe the attitude indicated above and to abstain from any resort to the use of force against the other Party, its nationals, their property or their rights.

"The Norwegian Government accordingly agrees that the request for the indication of interim measures of protection made by it in its application of July 18th, 1932, should be read as contemplating measures applying equally to both Parties in the present suit."

The President then observed with regard to the first sentence of this declaration that it concerned the merits of the dispute and was therefore outside the scope of the present proceedings.

At the afternoon meeting, M. Steglich-Petersen, Agent and Advocate for the Danish Government, stated the views of his Government. Then M. Arne Sunde replied for the

Norwegian Government, and finally M. Rasmussen rejoined for the Danish Government. In the course of the rejoinder, the President reminded M. Rasmussen of the limits of the proceedings.

At the conclusion of the parties' statements, the President of the Court informed the Agents of the Parties that in so far as the representatives might have in certain passages of their observations encroached upon the merits of the dispute—and he was of opinion that they had done so—he would ask the Court to decide what value should be attached to such passages.

The hearing was then declared closed, subject to the right of the Court, should it see fit, to ask the parties for further information.

TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES

TO THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS,

GENEVA.

Tenders are invited for the supply of the following articles :

1. Office furniture.
2. Stencil-, duplicating-, printing-, writing-, type-writing, packing- and carbon-paper, envelopes, etc.

Closing date : September 30th, 1932.

Particulars may be obtained from the Secretariat of the League of Nations, Geneva.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

QUARTERLY BULLETIN OF THE HEALTH ORGANISATION

JUST OUT

Vol. I. Nos. 1 and 2.

No. 1 contains, besides the Editorial, the following articles:—

Immunisation Against Diphtheria: Resolutions of the Conference held in London in June, 1931; Medical Education in England, by Sir George Newman; The Milk Supply of North-American Cities, by Professor R. Burri; Tropical Pneumonia, by R. Gautier; Second Analytical Review of Reports from Pasteur Institutes on the Results of Anti-Rabies Treatment, by Lieut.-Col. A. G. McKendrick; The Floods in China: Report by the Medical Director of the Health Organisation on the Work Undertaken to Co-ordinate the Campaign Against Epidemics.

No. 2 contains the following articles:—

Medical Education in the German Reich, by Drs. C. Hamel, J. Jadassohn, C. Prausnitz, and M. Taute; Report of the Commission on the Fumigation of Ships; Malaria and Anophelines in Siam, by Dr. L. Anigstein; Current Notes on the Work of the Health Organisation.

Annual subscription rate, 4 numbers	Post free: 7/6.	\$2.00.
Single number	2/-. \$0.50.

EPIDEMIOLOGICAL REPORT

(French and English texts.)

The Service of Epidemiological Intelligence and Public Health Statistics, Health Section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, receives current official reports on the prevalence of notifiable diseases from nearly all countries where such information is available. The information at present being regularly received and published in this periodical relates to 68 per cent. of the world's population.

Annual subscription, 12 numbers	18/-.	\$4.50.
Per number	1/6. \$0.40.

WEEKLY EPIDEMIOLOGICAL RECORD

(French and English texts.)

The *Weekly Epidemiological Record* appears every Thursday evening; it averages 12 pages and contains information regarding the movement of plague, cholera, yellow fever, small-pox, typhus, and any other diseases which may be an international menace at the time, such as influenza.

Annual subscription, 52 numbers	20/-.	\$5.00.
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	-------	---------

Complete catalogue sent free on application.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT, GENEVA

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly):

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 5s. \$1.25

4. *LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual)

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (Trilingual) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

9. *I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual):

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

{ Paper bound	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
{ Cloth bound	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS:

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

*Studies on Industrial Relations. I. xii + 253 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. II. v + 162 pp.	{ Paper bound	3s. 6d.	\$1.00
	{ Cloth bound	5s. 0d.	\$2.00
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky. v + 212 pp.		4s. 0d.	\$1.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930. iv + 692 pp.		16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
	{ Cloth bound	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building. xii + 378 pp.		5s. 0d.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation. vii + 381 pp.		8s. 0d.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene. vii + 188 pp.		6s. 0d.	\$1.50
*Women's Work under Labour Law iv + 264 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)

.. .. .	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
---------	------------	---------

.. .. .	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
---------	------------	---------

.. .. .	£3 10s. 0d.	\$20.00
---------	-------------	---------

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

<p>GREAT BRITAIN Mr. M. R. K. BURGE, 12, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1. (Telegrams: Interlab, Sowest, London.) Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)</p>	<p>U.S.A. <i>American Sales Agents:</i> WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION, 40, Mount Vernon Street, Boston 9, Mass.</p>	<p>JAPAN Mr. J. ASARI, Shisei Kalkan Bldg., Hibiya Park, Kojimachiku, Tokio. (Telegrams: Kokusairodo, Tokio.) Telephone: Ginza 1580.)</p>	<p>INDIA Mr. P. P. PILLAI, International Labour Office (Indian Branch) New Delhi. (Telegrams: Interlab, New Delhi.)</p>
--	---	--	--

PUBLICATIONS DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

REVIEW OF WORLD TRADE, 1930

Vol. I. of the Memorandum on Trade and Balances of Payments, 1930
(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 28/I.)

68 pages Price: 2/6. \$0.60.

This volume contains a condensed analysis of trade movements in 1930 and certain preliminary information concerning trade during the first half of 1931. Summary tables are given showing the trade of all the more important countries of the world in recent years, and separate sections in the text deal with the trade of individual countries (and groups of countries), commercial balances, trade by classes of commodities, the direction of trade and changes in import and export prices and in the quantum of trade.

BALANCES OF PAYMENTS, 1930

(Including an Analysis of Capital Movements in 1931)

Vol. II. of the Memorandum on Trade and Balance of Payments, 1930
(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 28/II.)

183 pages Price: 6/-. \$1.50.

This volume contains estimates of the international transactions (trade in goods and services, gold, long- and short-term capital operations) and of the outstanding international liabilities and assets of about thirty countries, together with notes explaining the methods employed in calculating certain of the figures. The majority of the estimates refer to 1930 or 1929; for purposes of comparison, figures for a number of earlier years are also given. In a general chapter, the international movements of capital and their relation to relative prices, interest and dividends, freights, emigrants' remittances and tourist expenditure are summarised.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE STATISTICS, 1930

(Including provisional summary figures for 1931)

Vol. III. of the Memorandum on Trade and Balances of Payments, 1930
370 pages Price: 10/-. \$2.50.

This volume contains detailed trade statistics of sixty-four countries, showing imports and exports of merchandise and of bullion and specie, imports and exports by countries, by principal articles and by classes of commodities (Brussels classification, 1913). A synoptical table shows the percentage distribution, by countries of provenance and destination, of each country's imports and exports. The volume covers the years 1928, 1929 and 1930; available totals for 1931 are, however, also given in a special table.

IN THE PRESS.

WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY, 1931-32

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 18.)

About 300 pages Price: In wrapper, about 6/-. \$1.50.
Bound in cloth, about 7/6. \$2.00.

The Survey contains a brief summary of the economic developments of the first decade after the war, in order to provide a background for an understanding of the crisis which developed in 1929.

The second chapter gives a brief description of the course of the depression. This narrative and the detailed chapters which follow are brought as close up to date as possible, information being given in many instances up to the middle of 1932. After the narrative of events, different aspects of economic life in the depression are examined in successive chapters. Starting with the production of commodities, the Survey proceeds to discuss the fall in prices, the shrinkage of international trade, difficulties in balancing international accounts, changes in banking structure and policy, wages and unemployment, public finance and commercial policy. A final chapter surveys the various proposals made for the alleviation of the crisis whether by national or by international action.

REVIEW OF WORLD PRODUCTION, 1925-31

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 13.)

About 130 pages Price: About 3/3. \$0.80.

This volume is a continuation of the *Memorandum on Production and Trade* which was published year by year from 1926 to 1931. It contains an analysis of certain phenomena of the greatest significance for the study of the economic depression—the changes in the world output of raw materials and foodstuffs, in industrial activity in the principal industrial countries, and in the activity of certain important industries, and, finally, relative movements in prices.

Complete catalogue sent free of charge on application to
PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT, LEAGUE OF NATIONS, GENEVA.

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., Nos. 8 AND 9.

AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1932.

Thirteenth Ordinary
Session of the Assembly.

Reduction and Limitation
of Armaments.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - - 1/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.

Agents for the United States:
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies:
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada:
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., Nos. 8 and 9.

AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Months of August and September</i>	244	3. Communications and Transit Organisation :	
II. <i>Organisation of Peace :</i>		(a) Programme of Public Works	252
1. Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments	246	(b) Petition from the Zeltweg-Wolfsberg und Unterdrauburg-Woellan Railway Company	254
2. Co-operation of the Press in the Organisation of Peace	249	(c) Application from the Nagykikinda-Arad Local Railway Company under Art. 304 of the Treaty of Trianon	254
III. <i>Commission of Inquiry for European Union</i>	249	VI. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>	
IV. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		1. Adjustment of the Activities of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and Composition of the International Committee	254
International Engagements :		2. Work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation	255
(a) Ratification and Signature of Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations	250	3. Mission of Chinese Educationists to Europe	255
(b) Registration of Treaties	250	VII. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>	
V. <i>The Technical Organisations :</i>		1. Mandates. Termination of the Mandatory Régime in Iraq	256
1. Health Organisation :		2. Fiftieth Report of the Saar Governing Commission	256
(a) Studies on Nutrition	251	VIII. <i>Protection of Minorities :</i>	
(b) Campaign against Venereal Diseases	251	Petition from Representatives of the Descendants of the former Szekler Frontier Guard Regiment	257
2. Economic and Financial Organisation :		IX. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
(a) Meeting of the Preparatory Commission of Experts for the Monetary and Economic Conference	251	1. Appeal from the Chinese Government	257
(b) Work of the Economic Committee	252	2. Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay	259
(c) Procedure for the Friendly Settlement of Economic Disputes between States	252		
(d) Meeting of the Financial Committee	252		

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

	PAGE
X. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions :</i>	
1. Permanent Central Opium Board	264
2. Gift offered by Mr. A. E. Blanco	265
3. Committee of Experts on Slavery	265
XI. <i>Obituary :</i>	
1. Tribute to the Memory of Count Gravina	266
2. Tribute to the Memory of M. Clan	266
XII. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	267

<i>The Permanent Court of International Justice.</i>	
	PAGE
1. Twenty-fifth Session of the Court	267
2. Interpretation of the Statute of Memel	267
3. Legal Status of certain parts of South-Eastern Greenland	269
4. Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 on the Employment of Women during the Night	270
5. Administration of the Prince of Pless	270

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTHS OF AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER.

The League of Nations, whose activities had slackened during August, resumed work with fresh vigour in September.

The main activities were meetings of the Bureau of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, of the Council, the Assembly, the Commission of Inquiry for European Union, the Financial Committee and the Committee on Liberia.

* * *

The Thirteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly opened on September 26th. Fifty-three of the fifty-six States Members of the League of Nations were represented, namely: Abyssinia, South Africa, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Salvador, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The Argentina Republic, Honduras and the Dominican Republic did not send delegations.

At this thirteenth session were present one President of State, M. Motta (Switzerland), four Prime Ministers, M. Mouchanoff (Bulgaria), M. Herriot (France), M. Bech (Luxemburg), and Mr. de Valera, President of the Executive Council of the Irish Free State, and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs from the following nineteen countries: Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, the Netherlands,

Norway, Persia, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and Yugoslavia.

The session was opened by the President in Office of the Council, Mr. de Valera (Irish Free State). After a brief survey of the League's activity during the past year in the various spheres of its work, he emphasised the difficulties which it had been called upon to surmount. To-day, as perhaps never before, the eyes of all nations were turned towards Geneva.

"There is," he said, "on all sides complaint, criticism and suspicion. People are complaining that the League is devoting its activity to matters of secondary or very minor importance, while the vital international problems of the day, problems which touch the very existence of our peoples, are being shelved or postponed or ignored. People are saying that the equality of States does not apply here in the things that matter, that the smaller States, whilst being given a voice, have little real influence in the final determination of the League action, that they have not that which they were intended, and are entitled, to have under the Covenant.

"People are becoming impatient, and starting even to inquire whether the apparently meagre face-saving results of successive League conferences and meetings justify the burden which contributions to the League budget, and the expense of sending delegation after delegation to Geneva, impose upon the already overburdened national taxpayer. Finally, there is a suspicion abroad that little more than lip-service is paid to the fundamental principles on which the League is founded; there is a suspicion that the action of the League in the economic sphere can be paralysed by the pressure of powerful national interests, and

that, if the hand that is raised against the Covenant is sufficiently strong, it can smite with impunity. . . . The satisfaction with the position and the work of the League which we may feel in this Assembly is not shared universally by opinion outside . . . complacent resolutions cannot satisfy the general demand for effective action."

"A great deal of the criticism of the League is," he said, "without a doubt, unjustified. A great deal is uninformed. A great deal is, perhaps, not wholly disinterested. . . . The one effective way of silencing criticism of the League is to show unmistakably that the Covenant is a solemn pact, the obligations of which no State, great or small, could find it possible to ignore. The only alternative to competitive armaments is the security for national rights which an uncompromising adherence to the principles of the Covenant affords. The avoidance of wars and of the burden of preparatory armaments is of such concern to humanity that no State should be permitted to jeopardise the common interest by selfish action contrary to the Covenant, while no State is powerful enough to stand for long against the League if the Governments of the League and their peoples are determined that the Covenant shall be upheld."

Turning to the future, Mr. de Valera stated that failing progressive disarmament it was almost impossible that the League should continue to exist; thus the success of the Disarmament Conference was of paramount importance. He felt that the forthcoming Economic Conference, too, was of equal interest. International measures were essential if world collapse were to be avoided.

At the close of his speech he expressed the Assembly's regret at the resignation of Sir Eric Drummond—Secretary-General of the League since its foundation—paying a tribute to his courtesy, impartiality and wisdom.

Election of the President.—M. Politis (Greece) was elected President of the Thirteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly by forty-four votes out of fifty registered.

M. Politis thanked the Assembly for the honour done to his country in electing him to occupy the post.

He said that the Thirteenth Assembly was opening in an atmosphere of anxiety—a cause for rejoicing among the League's adversaries. It, in the midst of the troubles and difficulties of the hour there was one thing which banished fear and gave grounds for hope it was that rudimentary international organisation—the League of Nations. No doubt the guarantees

which it could at present offer were not as effective as could be wished; they must then be supplemented, extended and strengthened. "The privations arising out of the present crisis have brought home to the peoples the fact that solidarity and co-operation constitute in international relations laws as invariable as those which apply in the relations of individuals within their own country. The peoples are realising more and more that international peace, like social peace, depends on the existence of a legal order in which the general interest comes before the individual, in which collective force replaces individual force."

Distribution of Items among the Committees.—Six Committees are set up each year. For convenience sake the work was this year divided among five Committees.

All the questions regarding the reduction of armaments formerly dealt with by the Third Committee having been discussed already by the various Commissions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the Assembly deemed it unnecessary to ask this Committee to consider the same subjects. The Committees, however, retained their usual numerical titles.

First Committee: Legal and Constitutional Questions.—(Nationality of Women; Situation regarding the entry into force of the Protocol of September 14th, 1929, on the subject of the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice; Amendment to the Assembly's Rules of Procedure.) President: M. Beelaerts van Blokland (Netherlands); Vice-President: M. Limburg (Netherlands).

Second Committee: Technical Organisations.—(Work of the Economic and Financial Organisations, of the Communications and Transit Organisation and of the Health Organisation; Convening of a World Monetary and Economic Conference; Draft Protocol for facilitating the international circulation of Films of an Educational Character.) President: M. Te Water (South Africa); Vice-President: M. Zaunius (Lithuania).

Fourth Committee: Organisation of the Secretariat and Finances of the League.—(Organisation of the Secretariat, the International Labour Office and the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice; Election of one full member and two substitute members of the Supervisory Commission; the League Wireless Station; Budget for 1933; Expenditure of the League of Nations.) President: M. de Vasconcellos (Portugal); Vice-President: M. William Rappard (Switzerland)

Fifth Committee: Social and Humanitarian Questions.—(Penal and Penitentiary Questions, Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs, Traffic in Women and Children.) President: Count Carton de Wiart (Belgium); Vice-President: Dr. Ethel Osborne (Australia).

Sixth Committee: Political Questions.—(Commission of Inquiry for European Union; Co-operation of Women in the Organisation of Peace; Nansen International Office for Refugees; Slavery; Co-operation of the Press in the Organisation of Peace; Intellectual Co-operation; Request for the Admission of Iraq to the League of Nations; Mandates; Minorities.) President: M. Lange (Norway); Vice-President: M. Porto Seguro (Chile).

Agenda Committee.—The Assembly, following its usual practice, set up an Agenda Committee to consider the procedure to be followed as regards the placing of new questions of the agenda. The following were members of the Committee:

Sir Donald Cameron (Australia).
M. Antoniadé (Roumania).
Sir William Malkin (United Kingdom).
M. Constantin Mayard (Haiti).
M. Pilotti (Italy).

Dr. Tevfik Rustu Bey (Turkey).
M. Westman (Sweden).
President: Tevfik Rustu Bey.

Constitution of the Bureau of the Assembly.—The Bureau of the Assembly consists of the President and the twelve Vice-Presidents; since the Presidents of the Committees are *ex officio* Vice-Presidents of the Assembly, six further Vice-Presidents were elected:

Baron Aloisi (Italy).
Sir John Simon (United Kingdom).
M. Herriot (France).
Freiherr von Neurath (Germany).
M. Medina (Nicaragua).
M. Nagaoka (Japan).

On the President's proposal the Assembly decided to elect as honorary members of the Bureau M. Motta (Switzerland) and M. Hymans (Belgium).

* * *

The general discussion on the Council's report to the Assembly opened on September 27th. In accordance with the practice of former years the various delegations gave their views on the work accomplished during the year by the organs of the League in the various fields of its activity.

II.—ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

I. CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

In accordance with the resolution passed on July 23rd by the General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments (Part III., paragraph 6), the Bureau of the Conference met at Geneva on September 21st, Mr. Henderson presiding, to consider the Conference's programme of work.

The President first read a letter from the German Government, dated September 14th, stating that the meeting would not be attended by its representative. He also informed the Bureau of his reply to this letter.*

He further announced that the Soviet Government had stated that it would not send representatives to the Technical Commissions of the Conference until the General Commission had taken the impending decisions of principle.†

M. Beneš (Czechoslovakia), rapporteur, submitted a programme of work drawn up on the

lines of the annex to the resolution of July 23rd. This programme covered the following points:

(a) Drafting of texts for the points in regard to which agreement has already been reached.

1. Complete prohibition of air attacks against the civil population.
2. Prohibition of chemical warfare.
3. Supervision.

(b) Questions in regard to which it will be necessary to negotiate but on which the points of principle are already settled.

1. Abolition between Contracting Parties of all aerial bombardment, subject to agreement with regard to measures to be adopted for the purpose of rendering effective the observance of this rule.

2. Limits to be fixed for the calibre of heavy artillery.

3. Maximum tonnage of tanks.

(c) Questions of a controversial character, the solutions of which must be prepared.

1. Effectives.
2. Limitation of national defence expenditure.
3. Manufacture and Trade in Arms.

* For the text of the German Government's letter and Mr. Henderson's reply see Annex.

† The President also informed the Bureau that a certain number of Governments had already accepted an extension of the Armaments Truce beyond November 1st, 1932, in accordance with the Conference's recommendation of July 23rd.

4. Naval Armaments.

5. Violations of the provisions relating to the prohibition of the use of chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons.

(d) General and political questions.

After a discussion which continued until September 26th, the Bureau took the following decisions:

(a) 1. *Complete prohibition of air attacks against the civil population.*

It requested M. de Madariaga, President of the Air Commission, to prepare a report on the best procedure to be followed in the matter of complete prohibition of air attacks against the civil population, and of the abolition between the Contracting Parties of all aerial bombardment, subject to agreement with regard to measures to be adopted for the purpose of rendering effective the observance of this rule.

(a) 2. *Prohibition of chemical warfare; and*

(c) 5. *Violations of the provisions relating to the prohibition of the use of chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons:*

M. Pilotti (Italy), President of the Special Committee on Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare, was requested to submit a report to the Bureau on these questions.

On point (a) 3. *Supervision:*

M. Bourquin (Belgium) was asked to consult with the various delegations for the purpose of preparing a report.

On points (b) 2. *Limits to be fixed for the calibre of heavy artillery,* and 3. *Maximum tonnage of tanks:*

M. Buero (Uruguay), President of the Land Commission, was asked to submit a report to the Bureau after consultation with the various delegations.

On point (c) 1. *Effectives:*

The Bureau, on the proposal of the United States representative, decided to set up a Special Committee consisting of the delegates of the States represented on the former Committee on Effectives,* together with any members of the Bureau not represented on this original Committee. It was agreed that this enlarged Committee should itself draw up its terms of reference, and that the countries not represented thereon might make their views known on any aspects of the problem of particular concern to them.†

* See Monthly Summary, May, 1932, page 146.

† This Special Committee on Effectives met on September 30th and elected M. de Brouckère (Belgium) as its President. The next number of the Monthly Summary will give an account of its work.

On point (c) 2. *Limits to be fixed for the calibre of heavy artillery:*

The Bureau postponed its decision on this matter until completion of the work of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure (the Commission is expected to terminate its work in December).

On point (c) 3. *Manufacture and Trade in Arms:*

In accordance with the resolution of July 23rd, the Bureau decided to set up a Committee consisting of the representatives of South Africa, Belgium, China, Denmark, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Persia, Poland, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.‡

On point (c) 4. *Naval Armaments:*

The Bureau asked Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) to keep it informed of the negotiations undertaken in accordance with the resolution of July 23rd between the Powers signatory to the Washington and London Naval Agreements.

On point (d). *General and Political Questions:*

Since the resolution of July 23rd required one month's notice for the convening of the General Commission, the Bureau decided that it would consider the question of summoning that Commission at a meeting to be held during the week beginning on October 10th.

* * *

The Technical Committee of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure, which had continued to meet until August 5th, resumed work on September 12th. It conducted a verbal examination of the documentation submitted by Roumania, Japan, and Belgium. The procedure provided for in the Committee's Rules of Procedure was set on foot in respect of Austria, Finland, New Zealand and Australia.

ANNEX.

Letter from the German Government to the President of the Conference.

BERLIN.

14th September, 1932.

SIR,

On behalf of the Government German I have the honour to communicate to you the following.

In the course of the discussion of the General Commission, which led up to the adoption of the resolution of July 23rd, 1932, the head of the German delegation indicated the reasons for which the German Government was unable to accept the resolution in question. He pointed

‡ This Committee met for the first time on October 4th.

out that in view of the stage reached by the discussions of the Conference the question of equality of rights of the disarmed States could no longer remain without a solution. On that occasion he accordingly declared that the German Government could not take part in the further labours of the Conference before the question of Germany's equality of rights had been satisfactorily cleared up.

The resolution having been adopted, nevertheless, it is clear even now that the future Disarmament Convention will fall far short of the system of disarmament laid down by the Versailles Treaty, and will differ therefrom essentially both as regards the form and the manner of the disarmament. The question of how the future régime is to be applied to Germany thus becomes a matter of direct and immediate importance. It is obvious that unless this question is answered no settlement of individual concrete points of the disarmament problem is possible.

In the German Government's view only one solution can be considered, namely, that all States should be subject to the same rules and principles in respect of disarmament, and that no discriminatory exceptional system should exist in the case of any one of them. Germany cannot be expected to take part in the negotiations with regard to the measures of disarmament to be laid down in the Convention until it is established that the solutions which may be found are also to apply to Germany.

With a view to the earliest possible realisation of the condition for the future co-operation of Germany with the Conference, the German Government has in the interval endeavoured to clear up the question of equality of rights through diplomatic channels. Unfortunately it must be stated that the German efforts have not hitherto led to any satisfactory result. Under these circumstances I find myself compelled to my regret to inform you that the German Government is unable to avail itself of the invitation to the session of the Bureau of the Conference which is to begin on September 21st, 1932.

The German Government is now, as ever, convinced that thoroughgoing general disarmament is urgently necessary for the purpose of ensuring peace. It will follow the labours of the Conference with interest, and will determine its further attitude by the course which they may take.

I have, etc.,

(Signed) BARON VON NEURATH.

Reply of the President of the Conference to the Letter of the German Government.

GENEVA.

18th September, 1932.

I have the honour to acknowledge Your Excellency's letter of September 14th.

Need I say how much I regret the information which you convey to me that the German Government has decided not to participate in the session of the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference which I have summoned for September 21st, in accordance with the resolution of the General Commission.

The German Government apparently bases that decision on the assumption that, the resolution of the General Commission of July 23rd having been adopted, it is clear that the future Disarmament Conference will fall far short of the system of disarmament laid down by the Versailles Treaty, and will differ therefrom essentially, both as regards the form and manner of disarmament.

It would be outside my competence as President to enter into any discussion as to "the system of disarmament laid down by the Versailles Treaty." Since, however, I do not believe that the form and extent of disarmament to be brought about through the Convention are already determined, I feel bound to express my doubts as to the construction placed by the German Government on the bearing of the resolution of July 23rd. May I call Your Excellency's attention to certain provisions of that resolution?

First, in the preamble it is stated that "a substantial reduction of world armaments shall be effected, to be applied by a General Convention alike to land, naval and air armaments." Second, in the part concerning the conclusions of the first phase of the Conference (I would beg Your Excellency to notice these words, "the first phase") the following passage occurs:—

"The Conference, noting that agreement has now been reached on a certain number of important points, decides, *without prejudice to more far-reaching agreements hereafter*, to record forthwith the following concrete measures of disarmament which should form part of the General Convention to be concluded."

Third, Part 4 of the resolution, General Provisions:

"The present resolution in no way prejudges the attitude of the Conference towards any more comprehensive measures of disarmament, or towards the political proposals submitted by various delegations."

I trust Your Excellency will therefore agree that the form, extent, and scope of the ultimate Convention are still undetermined, and remain to be treated at the forthcoming sessions of the Conference and its Committees.

So much for the resolution itself. But further, may I ask Your Excellency to read the speech which I made as President of the Conference at the meeting of the General Commission on July 23rd, when the resolution was under consideration?

After quoting certain passages of the resolution, I said that a time would come when all the preparations in which we had been engaged month after month for six long months would produce a great gathering-in, and I added that if I thought that that gathering-in would not come in the second stage of the Conference, I should have to ask the Commission to excuse me from again coming to Geneva for a further six months; and lastly, that I trusted that all the representatives would vote for the resolution to come to Geneva in the autumn with the determination that we should have a great gathering-in and that our work would terminate in a General Convention which would secure a substantial reduction of world armaments, to be applied to land, naval and air armaments.

This is still my firm and honest conviction, and after weighing the reasons set out in this letter I sincerely trust that the German Government may reconsider its decision, and resume its participation at the earliest possible moment in the work of the Bureau, particularly as the prolonged absence of Germany from our deliberations may seriously affect the cause of general disarmament. I make this appeal the more confidently in view of the closing sentence of the letter which Your Excellency has been good enough to address to me.

I am naturally communicating to the members of the Bureau copies of Your Excellency's letter and of this reply.

(Signed) A. HENDERSON,

President of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

III.—COMMISSION OF INQUIRY FOR EUROPEAN UNION.

The Commission of Inquiry for European Union met on September 30th at Geneva, under the chairmanship of M. Motta, Acting President.

It had been convened in order to enable M. Georges Bonnet, President of the Stresa Conference, to give a verbal account of this Conference's results.

A*

2. CO-OPERATION OF THE PRESS IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.*

By its resolution of September 29th, 1931, the Council decided to have a report prepared for the 1932 Assembly on the question of inaccurate news which might disturb the maintenance of peace and good understanding between peoples.

It was stipulated that this report should deal both with the discussions on this subject at the Conference of Directors of Government Press Bureaux and Press Representatives convened at Copenhagen in January, 1932,† and with the results of the inquiries which the Council had requested the Secretary-General to make among press associations concerning this problem.

At its meeting of September 27th the Council forwarded to the Assembly the decisions of the Copenhagen Conference and the documentation collected by the Secretary-General.

The Copenhagen Conference had unanimously recognised that the rapid distribution of correct and detailed reports was one of the best means of preventing the spread of inaccurate information.

The documentation amassed by the League Secretariat had been collected from important international press associations and national organisations in sixteen countries. Journalists in distant countries such as Australia, Honduras, and New Zealand had also thought it worth their while to indicate their views.

Some of the replies received prove that the question raised was examined with the greatest care, giving rise to lengthy discussions. That of the International Federation of Journalists voiced the opinion of some thirty large national press associations, and thus constitutes very important evidence. The memorandum communicated by the International Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations is a carefully considered and exceptionally bold study of the problem.

Before opening the discussion, M. Motta paid a tribute to the memory of M. Aristide Briand. He pointed out that the Commission which he had founded and from which he hoped for great developments was the object of

* Rapporteur: the Spanish representative.

† See Monthly Summary, January, 1932, page 3.

M. Briand's special attention. He recalled that at the last meeting presided over by M. Briand, he had referred to himself as "a pilgrim of peace." Though M. Briand was no longer with them his spirit continued on the pilgrimage of which he had spoken.

M. Herriot (France) thanked the President for all that he had said of M. Briand, whose

devotion to the conception and development of the League was well known.

On the proposal of M. Motta (Switzerland) the Committee unanimously elected M. Edouard Herriot to the chair.

A detailed account of the work of the Commission will appear in the next number of the *Monthly Summary*

IV.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

(a) *Ratification and Signature of Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations.**

The Council, at its meeting of September 23rd, approved the report prepared by the Secretariat† on the ratification and signature of conventions concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The report, which contains a list drawn up in chronological order, shows the States which, either by ratification, accession or final signature, have become contracting parties to these conventions, those which, though they have signed these international undertakings, have not as yet ratified them, and, lastly, those which have neither signed nor acceded to the conventions drawn up during conferences at which they took part, or conventions to which they have been invited to adhere.

In accordance with the Council decision taken in March, 1928, the list prepared by the Secretary-General also contains all the reservations or declarations made by Governments at the time of their signature, ratification, or accession.

(b) *Registration of Treaties.*

The Treaties and Conventions registered with the League of Nations during August and September include:

A Declaration concerning reciprocal legal aid in civil and commercial matters between the Netherlands and Poland (The Hague, December 24th, 1931), presented by the Netherlands; and a Convention on the same subject between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Estonia (London, December 22nd, 1931), presented by Estonia.

A Convention between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Switzerland to prevent certain cases of double taxation (Berne, October 17th, 1931), presented by Switzerland.

A Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Arbitration between Greece and Poland, with additional Protocol (Warsaw, January 4th, 1932), presented by Poland.

A Treaty of Friendship between Lithuania and Persia (Moscow, January 13th, 1930), presented by Lithuania.

A Convention for the establishment of air navigation lines between France and Greece (Athens, June 5th, 1931), presented by Greece.

An Exchange of Notes between Austria and Yugoslavia covering an agreement as to the settlement of payments on exchanges of goods (Vienna, April 20th, 1932), presented by Yugoslavia.

A Commercial Agreement between France and Hungary amending the Commercial Convention of October 13th, 1925 (Budapest, September 25th, 1932), presented by Hungary.

An Exchange of Notes between Austria and Denmark covering an agreement authorising their consular and diplomatic representative in urgent cases to deliver to civil aircraft the permits required for flight over and, if necessary, for landing in their respective territories (Berne, April 14th and August 5th, 1932), presented by Denmark.

Parcel Post Agreements between Japan and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (Moscow, November 23rd, 1931), presented by Japan, and between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Hungary (London, May 11th, 1932, and Budapest, June 10th, 1932), presented by Great Britain.

A Treaty of Conciliation between Colombia and Sweden (London, September 13th, 1927), presented by Sweden.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, page 5.

† Rapporteur: the Italian representative.

V.—THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

I. HEALTH ORGANISATION.

(a) *Studies on Nutrition.*

A Committee of Experts met at Rome on September 2nd and 3rd, at the time of the International Physiological Congress, its purpose being to seek a basis of agreement in respect of the methods applied in studying nutrition in the various countries.

Hitherto very varying schedules of coefficients had been used to estimate the relative food consumption of the individuals composing a household (a consumption which varies with age and sex). The Committee standardised these schedules, thus rendering possible comparative studies of food consumption in different population groups.

The following took part in the Committee's work:

Chairman: Dr. E. P. Cathcart, Professor of Physiology at Glasgow University;

Dr. C. Banning (Netherlands);

Dr. E. Botazzi, Professor of Physiology at Naples University;

Dr. Carozzi, of the International Labour Office;

Dr. T. M. Carpenter, of the Nutrition Laboratory, Boston;

Dr. E. Gorter, Director of the Pediatric Clinic, Leyden University;

Dr. P. Heiberg, Health Expert, Copenhagen;

Dr. O. H. Kestner, Professor of Physiology at Hamburg University;

Dr. L. Lapique, Professor of Physiology at the Faculty of Science, Paris;

Dr. Helen Lippay-Wastl, Professor of Physiology at the Women's College of Medicine, Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dr. Niceforo, Professor of Political Economy at Rome University;

Dr. von Tyszka, of the Statistical Bureau, Hamburg.

(b) *Campaign against Venereal Diseases.*

The Health Committee instructed a Reporting Committee to set forth the principles and methods for a campaign against venereal diseases corresponding to the most modern and authoritative scientific findings. The report of this Committee should thus represent the sum total of the principles and doctrines advocated by high authorities in various countries. It will be placed at the disposal of the Health Administrations.

The Reporting Committee, at its meeting held at Geneva on September 1st, 2nd and 3rd,

1932, considered the work accomplished up to date.

The Committee is composed as follows:

Professor Jadassohn (Chairman), former Director of the Dermatological Clinic of Breslau University;

Professor Gougerot, Head of the Clinic for Skin Diseases of the Faculty of Medicine, Paris;

Colonel L. W. Harrison, British Health Ministry.

2. ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Meeting of the Preparatory Commission of Experts for the Monetary and Economic Conference.**

By a letter dated August 30th, 1932, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, as President of the Lausanne Conference, requested, on behalf of the inviting Powers of that Conference, that the Council of the League of Nations would agree (a) to allow the Preparatory Commission of experts to meet in Geneva; (b) to permit the Secretariat of the League of Nations to undertake the Secretariat of the Preparatory Commission; and (c) to fix a date, convenient to the League and to the nations concerned, for the meeting of the Preparatory Commission.

This request was forwarded by the Secretary-General to all the Members of the Council and to the Governments of Belgium and the United States, asking for their views on the questions raised.

No objections having been received, the Council acceded to Mr. MacDonald's request. The point concerning the date of the meeting was, however, referred to the Committee entrusted by the Council with questions relating to the organisation of the Monetary and Economic Conference.†

The French representative, M. Paul-Boncour, recalled that during the Council's earlier discussions it had been agreed that the Commission of Experts should have the help of the technical organs of the International Labour Office, and that the Committee of the Council responsible for the organisation of the Monetary and Economic Conference might usefully enlist the help of the Workers' Organisations represented on the International Labour Office.

M. de Madariaga (Spain), in the name of his Government, associated himself unreservedly with M. Paul-Boncour's observations. Mr. Eden

* Rapporteur: the representative of the United Kingdom.

† See Monthly Summary, July, 1932, page 226.

(United Kingdom) said that his Government had also had this point in mind but felt that the meeting of the Organising Committee of the Council on October 3rd would be a more appropriate time to raise it. The representatives of France and Spain accepted this view.

(b) *Work of the Economic Committee.*

The Council on September 23rd took note of the Economic Committee's report on the work of its thirty-eighth session.*

On this occasion, in view of the fact that the report† called for no decision, the Council merely stated that the conditions of international trade had not improved in the meantime and that the Economic Committee's conclusions still obtained.

The rapporteur, recalling that the Economic Committee had advocated close international co-operation in order successfully to combat the effects of the economic depression, added that certain indications justified the hope that this recommendation was being put into effect, as had been proved by the recent Stresa Conference.

(c) *Procedure for the Friendly Settlement of Economic Disputes between States.*

At its meeting of September 23rd the Council appointed the experts provided for in the Rules of Procedure and proposed by the Economic Committee in January last.‡

The experts are :

Sir John Baldwin (United Kingdom).
M. Roger Fighiera (France).
M. H. Ludovico Luciolli (Italy).
M. Unden (Sweden).
M. Henri Strassburger (Poland).
M. Hendrikus Colijn (Holland).
M. Jan Dvořáček (Czechoslovakia).
M. Augustin Vinuales (Spain).
M. Silas H. Strawn (United States).
M. H. Shinjiro Matsuyama (Japan).
M. Emilio Coni (Argentina).
M. Richard König (Switzerland).
M. Hans Ernst Posse (Germany).
Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee (India).

(d) *The Financial Committee.*

The forty-seventh session of the Financial Committee opened at Geneva on September 19th. Its agenda covered consideration of the financial and economic situation in Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Greece and Hungary.

The Committee was also called upon to deal with a request from the Roumanian Government for technical assistance from the League, and to note the results of the study carried out by the delegation which recently visited Roumania.

A report on the Committee's work will appear in the next number of the *Monthly Summary*.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT ORGANISATION.

(a) *Programme of Public Works.*

The Committee of Inquiry on Public Works and National Technical Equipment, presided over by M. Dorpmüller, General Director of the German Railways, held its third session at Geneva from September 7th to 10th.§ The agenda included consideration of a certain number of schemes for public works submitted by various Governments, and which had previously been studied by a rapporteur.

The 1931 Assembly had felt that among the measures likely to mitigate the effects of the economic depression and to promote renewed activity for workers in all countries the execution of great public works undertaken by public or private bodies, either within or outside Europe, might suitably be considered. It requested the Council to entrust the Committee of Inquiry set up by the Communications and Transit Organisation with the task of considering the concrete proposals of the various Governments.

In so doing, and in view of its terms of reference, the Committee abstained from studying the possibility or means of financing these operations. It only examined the schemes from the standpoint of their technical and economic value, though in some cases it supplied certain information which can be utilised later when the financial aspect of the problem comes to be considered.

The Committee retained a certain number of schemes, commending them to the attention of the Council. These schemes are :

Submitted by the Polish Government :

Programme of development of the long-distance telephone cable system ;

Scheme for extending the Warsaw water-supply and sewerage system ;

Programme of electrification works for Poland ;

Scheme for the supply of gas in the Polish coalfields.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 6, page 187.

† Rapporteur : the German representative.

‡ See Monthly Summary, January, 1932, page 9.

§ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 4, page 128.

Submitted by the Yugoslav Government :

Scheme for the improvement of the port of Belgrade ;

Scheme for the improvement of the State railways.

Submitted by the Bulgarian Government :

Programme of drainage and river correction in the Kara-Boaze, Messemvria and Mandra-Yakezli districts.

Submitted by the Austrian Government :

Programme for the reconstruction of roads.

Submitted by the Hungarian Government :

Programme for the reconstruction of national roads.

The Committee also retained certain schemes in principle, stating that its final decision was subject to the despatch of supplementary information by the Government concerned. The following schemes came under this head :

Part of a programme of road and bridge construction, and a programme of drainage in the Vidine and Provadia plains, submitted by the Bulgarian Government ;

A programme for the construction of railways, submitted by the Roumanian Government ;

A plan for the construction of railways, submitted by the Hungarian Government.

The Committee was not in a position to give an opinion on the other schemes submitted to it, since the documentation supplied was not sufficient to permit of it.

The Committee was composed as follows :

Dr. Dorpmüller, General Director of the German railways ;

M. Steuernagel, Assistant ;

Sir John Baldwin, representative of Great Britain on the International River Commissions ;

M. C. Buttini, Chief of the Italian Civil Engineers ;

M. A. Konopka, Engineer, Chief of Section in the Polish Ministry of Public Works ;

M. Silvain Dreyfus, representing the Advisory and Technical Committee on Communications and Transit.

Rapporteurs :

For the construction of roads and bridges : M. de Kerviler, Inspector-General of French Roads and Bridges ;

For Urban and Waterworks : M. Nijhoff, Consulting Engineer, The Hague ;

For Railways : M. R. Richard, Engineer of Belgian Railways ;

For Electric Questions : Dr. E. h. G. Dettmar, Professor at the Technical University, Hanover ;

For Telegraphs and Telephones : M. Kay Christiansen, Chief of the Technical Division of Posts and Telegraphs of Denmark ;

For the Distribution of Gas : M. G. Schneider, French Government Mining Engineer.

For the International Labour Organisation : M. Jouhaux, Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, representing the workers (French) on that Body ; M. Picquenard, Director at the French Ministry of Labour ; M. Vogel, Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, employers' representative (German) on that Body.

* * *

The Council at its meeting of September 24th, after noting the Committee of Inquiry's report, requested the Committee to proceed with the examination of the schemes, the study of which had been suspended, and to consider any fresh schemes laid before it.

It further asked the Secretary-General to forward to the Commission of Experts set up in accordance with Annex V of the Lausanne Convention of July 9th, 1932, the results of the work of the Committee of Inquiry on Questions relating to Public Works and National Technical Equipment, with a view to the possible inclusion of that question in the agenda of the Economic and Financial Conference.

The rapporteur pointed out that, as the Committee of Inquiry had only considered the schemes submitted to it from the technical and economic point of view, the Council must decide as to the future development of the problem. He recalled the fact that the question had been from the outset regarded as an integral part of the general work of economic reconstruction.

M. Zaleski, the Polish representative, said that the time had come for envisaging practical realisation of the schemes recommended by the Committee. He felt that the great public works of international interest which the Committee had considered should constitute one of the essential elements of the economic and financial reconstruction of Europe and of Central and Eastern Europe in particular.

The Yugoslav representative, M. Yevtitch, while approving the Committee of Inquiry's report, hoped that first the Committee of Experts, and later the Economic Conference, would bear in mind the capital importance which the countries concerned attach to the question of public works. He felt that, of the efforts made by the European States to mitigate the present crisis, the execution of works in common was one of the most

effective means of reducing unemployment and furthering economic revival. Public works undertaken in a spirit of international solidarity were, in his view, the natural consequence of the conclusions reached by the Stresa Conference.

The Director of the International Labour Office, Mr. Butler, who was present at the meeting, reminded the Council that the International Labour Organisation had always felt that the question of public works was a factor in the general work of bringing about economic recovery and a partial remedy for unemployment.

(b) *Petition from the Zeltweg-Wolfsberg und Unterdrauburg-Woellan Railway Company, Vienna.**

In January, 1931, the Council had requested the Advisory and Technical Committee on Communications and Transit to consider the petition submitted by the Zeltweg-Wolfsberg und Unterdrauburg-Woellan Railway Company under Article 320 of the Treaty of St. Germain en Laye.† At its meeting of September 27th the Council noted the conclusions reached by this Committee.

In the hope that the parties concerned would

be able to conclude a friendly agreement, the Council decided to allow them a period of six months for that purpose. If in six months an agreement had not been reached the Council would take up the question afresh with a view to the appointment of arbitrators as provided in Article 320 of the Treaty of St. Germain en Laye.

The Yugoslav representative, M. Yevtitch, considered this time-limit adequate to enable the parties to the dispute to reach an agreement, which was desirable from every point of view.

(c) *Application from the Nagyikikinda-Arad Local Railway Company under Art. 304 of the Treaty of Trianon.‡*

The Nagyikikinda-Arad Local Railway Company, which had submitted to the Council an application under Article 304 of the Treaty of Trianon, informed the Council in a letter, dated March 4th, 1932, that its dispute with the Roumanian Government had been settled, and that it wished to withdraw its application.

The matter having thus been finally settled, the Council, at its meeting of September 23rd, noted the communication and withdrew the question from its agenda.

VI.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

I. ADJUSTMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION ORGANISATION.

The Council at its meeting of September 27th dealt with the adjustment of the programme and work of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and the composition of the International Committee.

This Committee had been asked in January, 1932, to study the adjustment of its programme to present circumstances, in order to

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 6, page 196.

† Article 320 of the Treaty of St. Germain contains the following provisions:

"With the object of ensuring regular utilisation of the railroads of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy owned by private companies which, as a result of the stipulations of the present Treaty, will be situated in the territory of several States, the administrative and technical reorganisation of the said lines shall be regulated in each instance by an agreement between the owning company and the States territorially concerned.

"Any differences on which agreement is not reached, including questions relating to the interpretation of contracts concerning the expropriation of the lines, shall be submitted to arbitrators designated by the Council of the League of Nations."

comply with the Assembly's suggestions made with a view to safeguarding the essential activities of the Organisation during a period of enforced restriction.

At its fourteenth session, held at Geneva in July, 1932,§ the Committee had drawn up a series of recommendations on the subject of its working and the renewal of the mandates of its members. It had also submitted various suggestions regarding the working of the Executive Committee, the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League, the Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, the Secretariat of the Organisation and the Educational Information Centres.

These various recommendations and suggestions were intended, while preserving the nature of the general activity of the organisation, temporarily to limit its scope.

The Committee further proposed to reduce the number of members of certain committees

‡ See Monthly Summary, January, 1932, page 13.

§ See Monthly Summary, July, 1932, page 230.

of sub-committees and the number of sessions of the Executive Committee.

The Council, on the proposal of M. Paul-Boncour, noted and endorsed these suggestions. It also renewed for a period of five years the appointment of Professor Gilbert Murray and Madame Curie-Skłodowska as members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, and appointed three new members for a like period: M. Loder (Netherlands), formerly President of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Dr. Shotwell (United States), Professor of History at the University of Columbia, and Dr. Krüss (Germany), Director of the Prussian State Library.

The Council further thanked the retiring members, Professors Einstein and Millikan and M. Destrée, for bringing to one of the League's most important activities the lustre of their names and the treasures of their intellect. It hoped that they would be willing to continue, in such a manner as they might deem most fitting, a co-operation upon which it set the greatest store.

In forwarding its report to the Assembly the Council asked that the Assembly should not be too strongly influenced by considerations of economy, and that it should not sacrifice the work of the Committee and the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation.

2. WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.*

At its meeting of September 23rd the Council took note of the work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.†

This work covered intellectual co-operation in the spheres of arts and letters, science, documentation, education, intellectual rights, broadcasting, cinematography and moral disarmament, as well as the educational reform in China.

The rapporteur to the Council, M. Paul-Boncour, summarising the work carried out during the year by the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation, paid a special tribute to the activity shown by the Paris Institute and by the Rome Institute of Educational Cinematography.

On M. Paul-Boncour's proposal, the Council adopted a resolution laying stress upon the

valuable co-operation of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation in the study of the problem of moral disarmament, and the importance of the results achieved by the mission of experts to China.

It expressed the conviction that the services rendered by the Organisation to the Chinese Government were of a nature to be of especial assistance to that Government in the task for which it had requested the aid of the League.

The Chinese representative, M. Yen, after expressing satisfaction at the results of the experts' mission to China, stated that he could not entirely support their conclusions, notably the criticisms in their report of the American educational methods introduced in China. He recalled that the Chinese Government had, in its turn, sent a mission of educationists to Europe to study the organisation of public instruction in all its forms.

3. MISSION OF CHINESE EDUCATIONISTS TO EUROPE.

As a sequel to the mission of educationists to China, organised by the League of Nations to assist that country to perfect its educational system,‡ the Chinese Government, anxious to facilitate the execution of the measures recommended by these experts, has decided to send a certain number of educationists to Europe to study, under the auspices of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation, institutions and teaching methods in certain countries.

These educationists will visit Denmark, England, Germany, France, Italy, and Poland, and later other countries, to study their administrative system and principal university and school centres from the point of view of public instruction.

The mission is composed as follows:

M. C. P. Cheng, Director of the College of Teaching at Nanking, President;

M. S. M. Lee, Director of the College of Engineers, National Chekiang University at Hangchow;

M. S. L. Yang, Professor of Pedagogy at the National University, Peking;

M. Y. S. Kuo, Director of Higher Education at the Ministry of Public Instruction at Nanking;

M. C. S. Lee, of Jena University (Germany);

M. Holsien Chen, former Commissioner of Education at Kiangsu.

* Rapporteur: the French representative.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 230 *et seq.*

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 231.

VII.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. MANDATES.

Termination of the Mandatory Régime in Iraq.

In May, 1932, the Council approved the terms of a Declaration to be made by the Iraqi Government upon the termination of the mandatory régime in its territory. It had subjected this termination to two conditions, acceptance of the Declaration and admission of Iraq to the League of Nations.*

The Declaration was signed and ratified by Iraq, and the Secretary-General informed the Council of it on July 13th.

The Council, at its meeting of September 24th, observing that the first of its conditions had been fulfilled, declared that the Mandate would *ipso facto* come to an end on the admission of Iraq to the League of Nations. On July 12th the Iraqi Government sent to the Secretariat of the League a request for admission, which has been placed on the agenda of the Assembly's thirteenth session. In accordance with Article 1 of the Covenant, the Council requested the Permanent Advisory Commission on Military, Naval, and Air Questions to consider Iraq's request for admission from the technical point of view.

During the discussion at the Council the rapporteur, the Yugoslav representative, M. Yevtitch, M. Paul-Boncour (France), and Baron Aloisi (Italy) congratulated the United Kingdom representative on the way in which his Government had carried out its task as mandatory Power. They also congratulated the new State, which was shortly to become a Member of the League.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) thanked the Council, and the Yugoslav representative in particular, for the understanding with which he had helped to conduct to a successful issue so difficult and important a matter.

He drew the Council's attention to three petitions from the Assyrian Community in Iraq which His Majesty's Government, as mandatory Power, had forwarded to the Mandates Commission in accordance with the usual procedure. He requested that these petitions should be given early consideration. The Council acceded to that request.

2. FIFTIETH REPORT OF THE SAAR GOVERNING COMMISSION.

The Governing Commission of the Saar Territory has forwarded to the Secretary-

General of the League of Nations its fiftieth report, which deals with the activity of the Commission during April, May, and June, 1932.

This report, of which the following is a brief summary, deals with the economic, social, and administrative situation in the Territory.

* * *

1. *Economic and Social Situation.*

The report gives statistics of the production of coal and coke, cast-iron and steel, and of the cost of living in the Territory. The number of unemployed increased from 42,394 in February to 42,881 in May.

2. *Administration.*

Finance.—The persistence of the economic crisis has not been without its effect on the communal budgets. Lower taxation receipts have led to a considerable decrease in financial resources, while expenditure on unemployment benefit has considerably increased. The budget of the Saar Governing Commission has exceeded its credits. At the beginning of the next quarter proposals will be made for economies and for increases in taxation.

Economic Measures.—As a result of the measures taken in France subjecting the importation of various goods to the quota system or to import authorisations in the Saar Territory, the Governing Commission has granted facilities to the population and trade of the Territory, on condition that the goods so imported are used exclusively for the benefit of the Saar population.

Education.—The Governing Commission has decided to give professional training to young men and girls out of work, and has issued a decree extending the obligation to attend school for young people who have not been apprenticed.

* * *

Composition of the Governing Commission.

The Saar Governing Commission is composed as follows:

M. G. G. Knox, Chairman (Department of Foreign Affairs, Department of the Interior);

Dr. D'Ehrnrooth (Public Works, Railways and P.T.T.);

M. Kossmann (Poor Law, Health, Agriculture, Forests, Labour, Social Insurance);

M. Morize (Finance, Economics, Control of the Mines, Aeronautics);

Dr. Zoricic (Justice, Education, and Public Worship).

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 158, and No. 6, page 234.

Monthly Summary of the International Labour Organisation

1932. Nos. 8-9

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER

This Summary is published on the responsibility of the International Labour Office, to which all observations or requests for information as to its contents should be addressed.

It is published for general information, and is not an official record.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Special Meeting of the Governing Body	39
Large-scale National and International Public Works	43
The International Labour Organisation and the Economic Conference	44
The Egyptian Prime Minister Visits the International Labour Office	44

A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BODY.

Unemployment and the Reduction of Hours of Work.

At the request of Mr. de Michelis, Italian Government representative, a Special Meeting of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was called by its Chairman, on 21 and 22 September, to discuss the reduction of hours of work in industry in view of the widespread unemployment which now prevails throughout the world.

Since the Organisation was established, this is the first time that the Governing Body has met under such conditions, which suggests how important and urgent the problem is that has necessitated a Special Meeting.

As a matter of fact, this problem would have come before the Governing Body in the regular way at its next ordinary Session, which is to take place at Madrid from 24 to 28 October, and will consider, among other things, the Resolutions adopted at the last Session of the International Labour Conference. These Resolutions included one submitted by Mr. Jouhaux, French workers' delegate, inviting the Governing Body of the International Labour Office "to investigate the question of the legal institution of the forty-hour week in all industrial countries, with a view to the early adoption of international regulations on the subject."

In consequence, however, of the aggravation of unemployment, which threatens to become even more severe during the forthcoming winter, and also of the proximity of the World Economic Conference, which is expected to be held at the end of the year and at which it is inevitable that all the great industrial problems will be raised, Mr. de Michelis considered that it was impossible to wait until the end of October to prepare schemes for rapid action with a view to reducing individual hours of work in industry as a means of employing a larger number of workers. For this reason, he asked for an urgent meeting of the Governing Body and proposed that a special Session of the International Labour Conference should be convened.

On further consideration, it was found that this latter proposal would meet with serious constitutional difficulties, owing to the time limits fixed

by the Treaty of Peace for convening the Conference and for sending the preparatory documentation to all the States Members. When the special Session of the Governing Body opened, Mr. de Michelis therefore agreed with the International Labour Office in suggesting a procedure which could be applied more easily and which was finally adopted. The principal stages of this procedure may be summarised as follows.

In January next, a Tripartite Preparatory Conference (that is to say, the Government, employers and workers of each State will be represented) will be held at Geneva. It was at first proposed to convene this Conference before the end of 1932, but to facilitate the participation of overseas countries the Governing Body decided on a later date.

The Conference will consider the technical problems arising out of a reduction of hours of work, which will be discussed in a report of the International Labour Office. This report will cover miners and salaried employees as well as industrial workers in general, but will leave seamen and agricultural workers out of account.

At its January Session the Governing Body will have before it the conclusions of the Preparatory Technical Conference, and will decide whether they should be communicated to the World Economic Conference and possibly to Governments for consideration as bases for the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements on the reduction of hours of work.

At its meeting this October the Governing Body will fix the final agenda of the Preparatory Technical Conference, and will decide whether the question of the reduction of hours of work should be placed on the agenda of the 1933 Session of the International Labour Conference with a view to the adoption of one or more Draft Conventions or Recommendations.

It had been suggested that the Governing Body should decide at once on this latter question, but in accordance with the Standing Orders a vote could not be taken without a unanimous agreement to that effect, which in this case was not forthcoming. The question will therefore be reconsidered at the Madrid Session.

However this may be, the decisions now taken by the Governing Body have carried the problem of hours of work a stage further. It is only fair to add that they were adopted after thorough discussion,

which gave a very definite impression that all the groups were agreed on the need of a detailed study of the problem and of making every possible effort to remedy the general depression. Any differences of opinion there were related solely to procedure and methods.

The Governing Body stressed the continuity of the work of the Organisation by also passing a resolution submitted by Mr. Picquenard, urging the Governments to ratify existing Conventions on hours of work. Finally, it displayed its readiness to make use of every possible means of combating unemployment by adopting a resolution for speeding up the study of the schemes for large international public works initiated by Albert Thomas.

The following is a brief account of the Special Session of 21-22 September:

In opening the Session, the Chairman, Mr. Ernest Mahaim, first of all paid homage to the memory of two former members of the Governing Body who have recently died, Mr. Sanchis Banús, who represented the Spanish Government at the last Session, and Mr. Henrik Vedel, representative of the Danish Government and substitute for the representative of the Belgian Government.

The three groups associated themselves with the President's words.

Mr. Bramsnaes, representative of Denmark, and Mr. Negrin, representative of Spain, thanked the Governing Body, in the name of their respective countries, for the sympathy expressed.

The Governing Body then passed to the examination of the question for which it had been convened, that of the reduction of hours of work as a means of combating unemployment.

The Chairman made a brief reference to the fact that he had convened the Governing Body at the suggestion of Mr. de Michelis, representative of the Italian Government.

Mr. de Michelis stated the reasons which had led his Government to suggest an immediate meeting of the Governing Body. At the end of his speech he submitted a draft resolution to convene a preparatory meeting before the end of the year, in accordance with the suggestion of the International Labour Office, with the object of studying the technical problems which arise in connection with hours of work, and to place the question of "the reduction of hours of work" immediately on the agenda of the next Session of the International Labour Conference, with a view to the adoption of one or more Draft Conventions or Recommendations. Moreover, Mr. de Michelis asked the Governing Body to call a meeting as soon as possible of the Mixed Committee on Unemployment of the Committee of Inquiry for European Union, so that it might continue its investigations, with special reference to the question of the international public works proposed by Albert Thomas.

Mr. Picquenard, representative of the French Government, also submitted a draft resolution calling the attention of all the Governments which had not yet ratified the existing Conventions on hours of work to the importance of ratification in the present circumstances. He added that the French Government was ready to support any action calculated to lead in the near future to an international solution of the problem of hours of work, paying tribute to the initiative taken by

Italy and recalling that this was not the first time that the question of hours of work and its bearing on unemployment had been dealt with by the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. Jouhaux referred to the proposals of the workers' group on previous occasions, the work of the Unemployment Committee of the Governing Body and the Resolution on the forty-hour week adopted at the last Session of the International Labour Conference. Speaking on behalf of the entire workers' group, he supported the proposal to convene a Preparatory Technical Conference before the end of the year.

Mr. Grieser stated that the German Government agreed with the Italian Government's proposals in respect both of the subject to be treated and of the procedure contemplated. His Government believed the situation to be now such that it was possible to take steps which might increase employment.

Mr. Oersted made a statement on behalf of the employers' group, Mr. Olivetti (Italy) excepted, confirming the attitude taken up by the employers' group at the last Session of the International Labour Conference during the discussion on Mr. Jouhaux's resolution concerning the forty-hour week. The employers' group drew attention to the fact that the Governing Body, in pronouncing on the report of its Unemployment Committee, has already instructed the International Labour Office to study the problem of hours of work in connection with unemployment. It would therefore be better to wait until the completion of the work. As soon as the Office had prepared a complete report on the subject the time would be ripe for the Governing Body to decide what steps should be taken.

Mr. Schorsch (Austrian workers' representative) stressed the need for a reduction of hours of work and for the maintenance of the purchasing power of the working class. He supported the proposal to convene a Preparatory Technical Conference.

Mr. Riddell (Canadian Government representative), while making certain reservations as regards the probable practical results of Mr. de Michelis's proposals to call a Preparatory Technical Conference and to place the question of the reduction of hours of work on the agenda of the next Session of the International Labour Conference, stated that he was prepared to accept them. He did not, however, think it wise to complicate these questions by introducing that of international public works.

Mr. Olivetti (Italian employers' representative) gave it as his opinion that the International Labour Office must occupy itself with the question of reduction of hours of work. Mr. de Michelis' proposal could not be met merely with an indefinite adjournment. It would, however, no doubt be of advantage to distinguish clearly between the reduction of hours of work as a remedy at a moment of crisis and reduction as a permanent measure.

Mr. Brablec, representing the Czechoslovak Government, declared himself in favour of all international measures capable of leading to a reduction of hours of work in industry. He supported the proposal to convene a technical conference for this purpose before the end of the year.

Mr. Norman (British Government representative) stated that his Government was prepared to consider any proposals for a reasonable reduction of working hours combined with the maintenance of

a reasonable standard of living. But he did not believe that the procedure suggested in the Italian proposal and the Office report would provide a satisfactory solution. He was therefore opposed to convening a Preparatory Technical Conference before the end of the year and to placing the question of a reduction of hours of work on the agenda of the International Labour Conference in 1933. In his opinion, the International Labour Office should continue the investigation of the problem already begun and, after the results of that investigation were available, the question should be submitted to the Governing Body itself and not to any other body.

Mr. Yoshisaka (Japanese Government representative) believed that the present crisis justified a re-examination of the question of working hours. In principle, he would not object to the convening of a special Preparatory Conference or to the consideration of the question by the International Labour Conference, provided that Article 401 of the Treaty of Peace were observed, that is to say, that overseas countries would have sufficient time to study the question beforehand. He also urged that the material collected by the International Labour Office should be completed.

Sir Atul Chatterjee (Indian Government representative) also pointed out the practical impossibility for distant countries of participating in a Special Conference convened at so early a date as that proposed. He did not think that such a Conference, held in such conditions, would lead to any practical results.

Mr. Lambert-Ribot (French employers' representative) stressed the difficulties of the problem of hours of work as now before the Governing Body. It was no longer a social problem but an economic problem with a variety of aspects. By inopportune action the International Labour Office might run the risk of creating serious economic disturbance. The question must therefore be examined with all possible precautions, and in the first place the documentation, which he considered at present insufficient, should be completed. Mr. Lambert-Ribot criticised the proposal to convene a Preparatory Technical Conference. He concluded his speech by demanding: (1) that there should be a definite programme for the study of the problem of hours of work which should cover the economic as well as the social aspects; (2) that the discussion should take place not at a Special Conference but in the Governing Body itself, sitting, if need be, as a general committee; (3) that the decision whether to place the question of the reduction of hours on the agenda of the International Conference should not be taken by the Governing Body until its Session in January next.

Mr. Hayday (British workers' representative), replying to those speakers who seemed to him to believe that the hours of work question was an entirely new one to the Governing Body, stated that this was by no means the case but that thorough investigations had been made. The repeated demand for additional study simply meant a playing for time. He was surprised at the attitude of the British Government and reminded the Governing Body that the British working-class movement had, on the contrary, clearly expressed itself in favour of a forty-hour week without any reduction in weekly earnings. Mr. Hayday con-

cluded by supporting, with the workers' group as a whole, the proposal for convening a Preparatory Technical Conference and placing the question before the next Session of the International Labour Conference.

Mr. Negrin (Spanish Government representative) also supported this proposal, as well as Mr. Picquenard's draft resolution urging the Governments to ratify the existing hours of work Conventions at the earliest possible date. Mr. Negrin also supported Mr. de Michelis's resolution in favour of speeding up the execution of large international public works. He stressed the urgency of taking measures with respect to unemployment.

Mr. Forbes Watson (British employers' representative) drew attention to the difficulties of the problem, which, he said, was not merely a labour question since the solution depended on all the economic and commercial factors of the depression. The employers fully agreed that the question should be studied. What they objected to was merely a hasty decision. A genuinely practical solution must be sought instead of merely making gestures; otherwise the unemployed would say "we asked for bread and you gave us a stone." Mr. Forbes Watson considered that the procedure proposed in Mr. de Michelis's resolution was not the best. He therefore opposed the convening of a Preparatory Conference and the inclusion of the question of the reduction of hours of work in the agenda of the next International Labour Conference. First of all, the studies and inquiries on the question undertaken by the International Labour Office should be continued and completed, and not until then would it be possible to say whether, in fact, a reduction of hours in industry would tend to produce the result desired, that is to say, a reduction of unemployment. At present there was no guarantee that this would be so.

Mr. Mertens (Belgian workers' representative) pointed out that a year ago the workers' group had proposed that the Governing Body should authorise the Director of the International Labour Office to convene a Conference of the States concerned with a view to inquiring into the possibility of international agreements on a reduction of working hours. At that time the proposal obtained only 6 votes, those of the workers' group. To-day the workers' group was gratified to see that the situation had changed and that many Governments were expressing a different view. Mr. Mertens, with the full agreement of his group, supported the proposal to convene a Preparatory Technical Conference before the end of the year. Whatever happened, nothing would prevent the International Labour Conference in 1933 from discussing the problem of hours of work. It would therefore be better to prepare for this discussion by the Technical Conference contemplated for November or December. The decision could not be postponed repeatedly on the pretext that the documentation was incomplete. Besides, there would be the World Economic Conference, which the last International Labour Conference had asked for in its Resolution. At this World Economic Conference it was indispensable that representatives of the International Labour Office should be present to submit carefully studied proposals on the question of hours of work. Mr. Mertens pointed out that the Preparatory Technical Conference must necessarily be a Tripartite

Conference, since it was inconceivable that, at a meeting responsible for finding remedies for the unemployment from which 30 million workers suffered, the workers should have no chance of making themselves heard. He added that for his part he would willingly agree that countries not members of the International Labour Organisation should be invited to attend the Preparatory Conference.

Mr. Čurčin (Yugoslav employers' representative) criticised Mr. de Michelis' proposal chiefly from the economic standpoint. He held that the time was not opportune for making the experiment of a new international Convention on the forty-hour week, which would add even more to the cost of production, considering that the Washington Convention on the forty-eight hour week had not yet been fully incorporated in the economic system.

Mr. Oersted (Danish employers' representative) expressed his entire conviction of the good intentions of the Italian Government in putting forward its proposal. In view of the depression and its disastrous consequences it was easy to understand the apprehensions of statesmen and their efforts to find a way out of the present situation. But the Governments and the workers were not the only ones to suffer from the crisis. The employers suffered too; and they too were ready to make every effort to find a remedy. The point at issue was, however, just what remedies to use. Mr. Oersted drew attention to the fact that the Italian proposal aimed at a permanent reduction of hours of work and not merely a temporary reduction for the period of the depression. This was, in fact, also the workers' view. The question therefore ceased to be a merely social one, such as would have been involved by a provisional measure intended to relieve unemployment during the period of depression. It became an economic question. Mr. Oersted also raised the problem of the connection between a reduction in hours of work and wages. Employers were asked to make sacrifices, but were the workers prepared to show equal good-will? If so, they must declare themselves ready to share the available employment and the corresponding remuneration with their unemployed comrades. In fact, however, this was not so. On the contrary, they demanded the maintenance of their present wages, which meant an increase in hourly rates and therefore in the cost of production. Mr. Oersted expressed himself opposed to convening a Preparatory Technical Conference and supported the declarations of Mr. Lambert-Ribot and Mr. Forbes Watson. He also objected to the placing of the question of hours of work in the agenda of the next Session of the International Labour Conference. He was prepared to discuss the whole question in the Governing Body, but this meant that the studies of the International Labour Office on the question should be completed and submitted to the Governing Body in the form of a report. The report could then be considered by the Governing Body at a special session to be convened before the end of 1932 at Geneva. Mr. Oersted accordingly put forward an amendment on these lines to Mr. de Michelis's proposal.

Mr. Zagrodski, on behalf of the Polish Government, and Mr. Bramsnaes, on behalf of the Danish Government, stated their readiness to vote in favour of Mr. de Michelis's proposals.

Mr. de Michelis, in a brief speech, reviewed the various observations arising out of his proposals and made it clear that he would personally agree to inviting every State, whether or not a member of the International Labour Organisation, to the contemplated Preparatory Conference.

Mr. Jouhaux pointed out that among the many studies published during the last few years in favour of a reduction of hours of work, many, not to say most, emanated from manufacturers and not by labour leaders.

Mr. H. B. Butler, Director of the International Labour Office, in summing up the discussion stated that it showed that there was general agreement on the need of a thorough study of the situation and of making some kind of attempt to remedy unemployment. He then gave some details of the practical conditions in which the proposed Preparatory Technical Conference might be held.

The votes were then taken.

By 13 votes to 6, the Governing Body rejected Mr. Oersted's amendment to submit the problems raised by a reduction of hours of work, which will be set forth in all their aspects in a report by the Office, for examination at a meeting of the Governing Body to be called at Geneva before the end of 1932.

By 18 votes to 6, the Governing Body adopted Mr. de Michelis's proposal to have the technical problems concerning the reduction of hours of work, which will be set forth in a report of the Office, studied at a Tripartite Preparatory Conference to be held in January, 1933, at Geneva.

The Governing Body decided further that the conclusions of that meeting should be submitted to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at its January Session so that it might consider the desirability of communicating them to the coming World Economic Conference and possibly to the Governments, to provide guidance for possible bilateral or multilateral agreements pending a possible discussion by the 1933 Session of the Conference.

It was further decided that miners and salaried employees should be covered by the reports to be submitted by the Office on the question of reduced hours of work.

Next, by 16 votes to 3, the Governing Body adopted Mr. de Michelis's proposal to request the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to take the necessary steps to call a meeting of the Mixed Committee on Unemployment of the Committee of Inquiry for European Union as soon as possible, so that it may discuss the questions which have already been considered at previous Sessions with a view to their being taken up as soon as possible with suggestions for practical action, special account being taken of the question of international public works proposed by Albert Thomas.

Finally, by 16 votes to 4, the Governing Body adopted the resolution submitted by Mr. Picquenard requesting the Office once again and with the utmost insistence to call the attention of all the Governments which have not yet ratified the Washington Convention of 1919 concerning the eight-hour day in industrial undertakings, the Convention of 1930 concerning hours of work in commerce and offices, and the Convention of 1931 concerning hours of work in coal mines, to the supreme importance in the present circumstances of the early ratification of the above-mentioned Conventions by the greatest possible number of States.

LARGE-SCALE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS

The effects of the campaign initiated by Albert Thomas, and unremittingly pursued by the International Labour Office, in favour of the commencement of large-scale public works calculated to improve the economic equipment of the countries concerned, and at the same time to provide work without delay for some of the unemployed, are beginning to be visible.

During recent months numerous statesmen, economists and employers have given their support to the proposal. A first step in a policy of international collaboration in public works has been taken in North America, where the Governments of Canada and the United States, in a Treaty recently concluded, have undertaken the joint execution of a project to make the Great Lakes accessible to ocean-going vessels. Further, on 21 July, 1932, the President of the United States signed an Act appropriating the sum of \$1,500,000,000 for the purpose of financing public works on a large scale. In France, the Minister of Public Works expressed the opinion, in a recent speech, that international agreements for the simultaneous execution of great public works constituted one of the most effective remedies for the dangers to which Europe was exposed, and added that the French Government was ready to respond to the appeal of the League of Nations; while the German Federal Chancellor has announced a vast programme of works providing for the expenditure of about 2,000,000,000 RM., and intended to give employment to 1,750,000 persons now out of work.

In the meantime the machinery of the League of Nations has not been idle. The Committee of Inquiry on Questions relating to Public Works and National Technical Equipment sat at Geneva from 7 to 10 September, 1932, with Mr. Dormmüller, Director-General of the German Federal Railways, in the Chair. The International Labour Organisation was represented by three members of its Governing Body, Mr. Picquenard (Government group), Mr. Vogel (employers' group), and Mr. Jouhaux (workers' group).

The Committee examined a number of schemes for public works submitted by various Governments, which had previously been studied by reporters. Among these it retained the following, which it recommended to the attention of the Council of the League of Nations:

A programme of development of the long-distance telephone cable system, a scheme for extending the Warsaw water supply and sewerage system, part of a programme of electrification works for Poland, and part of a scheme for the supply of gas in Polish Upper Silesia, submitted by the Polish Government;

A scheme for the improvement of the Port of Belgrade and a programme for the improvement of the State railways, submitted by the Yugoslav Government;

A programme of drainage in the Kara-Boaze, Messemvria and Mandra-Yakezli regions, submitted by the Bulgarian Government;

A road modernisation programme submitted by the Austrian Government;

A programme for the reconstruction of national roads submitted by the Hungarian Government.

Further, the Committee retained a number of schemes in principle, but reserved its decision regarding them until further information should be supplied by the Governments concerned. These were:

Part of a programme of road and bridge construction, and a programme of drainage in the Vidin and Provaida region, submitted by the Bulgarian Government;

A railway construction programme submitted by the Roumanian Government;

A railway construction programme submitted by the Hungarian Government.

For the other schemes submitted to it, the committee did not consider the documentation supplied sufficient to allow it to reach a conclusion.

The Council of the League of Nations examined the Committee's report at its meeting of 24 September, 1932.

Mr. de Madariaga (Spain), reporter on the question, pointed out that the number of schemes retained was considerable, but that the Committee had had to confine itself to the technical point of view without considering the financing of the work. Since international action in regard to public works was part of the general task of economic reconstruction, the reporter proposed the transmission of the results of the Committee's work to the Commission of Experts set up by the Lausanne Conference, with a view to the possible inclusion of the question in the agenda of the coming World Economic and Financial Conference. He proposed further that the Committee's report be transmitted also to the Assembly of the League of Nations for its consideration.

Mr. Zaleski (Poland) after congratulating the members of the Committee, stated that the time had come to contemplate giving practical effect to the schemes retained. He supported the reporter's proposal, for major public works should, in his view, be one of the principal factors in the economic and financial reconstruction of Europe, and more particularly of Central and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Yevtitch (Yugoslavia) also supported the reporter's proposals and expressed the opinion that the execution of large public works would prove to be one of the most effective means of combating the depression and of completing the work of the Stresa Conference.

Mr. Butler, Director of the International Labour Office, reminded the Council that these public works would be at least a partial remedy for unemployment.

The Council then adopted Mr. de Madariaga's report.

The Stresa Conference, which was appointed by the Lausanne Conference "with the duty of submitting to the Commission of Inquiry for European Union at its next session proposals as to measures required for the restoration of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe," also dealt directly with the problem of public works. It sat from 5 to 20 September, and, at the invitation of its Chairman, Mr. Georges Bonnet (France), Deputy

and former Minister, the International Labour Office was represented by Mr. Maurette, Chief of the Division, and Mr. Viple, Chief of Section.

The Economic and Agricultural Committee's report, which the Conference adopted, insists on the need for the execution, at the earliest possible date, of great national and international public works.

In addition to the facilities to be provided for transport by existing means, the report states that "consideration should be given to the means of rendering easier and less costly the transport of agricultural produce—for example, by creating better installations in the ports of exportation, by organising the warehousing of cereals, by constructing silos, and by developing transport facilities by the construction of country roads and the organisation of shipping routes. A lowering of transport rates would mean a great reduction in farmers costs.

"Studies in this domain have been already undertaken. The first Director of the International Labour Office, Mr. Albert Thomas, made special efforts in the last year of his life to create a current of activities and ideas in favour of a policy of national and international public works. He laid stress on the moral and economic desirability of replacing unemployment relief by employment in ordinary constructive undertakings.

"It is to be hoped that the studies undertaken will be actively pursued and will shortly lead to the submission of concrete proposals. The Committee has been informed of the programme of international and national public works recommended by the Commission of Inquiry for European Union, the Assembly and the Council of the League as being likely to reduce the number of unemployed attenuate the effects of the economic crisis and contribute towards a resumption of activities beneficial to all workers. The utility of such a policy in a period of crisis cannot be doubted. All the countries in which these works are carried out have a direct interest in them, while the other countries derive an indirect benefit, not only in consequence of the substantial improvements enjoyed by all users, but as a result of orders for plant and material, their repercussion on purchasing power, and the demand for commodities.

"Such works also present psychological and moral advantages by enlisting the interest of all the countries of Europe in a joint co-operative undertaking.

"Already a large number of plans prepared by Governments have been examined by the competent Technical Sub-Committee of the League of Nations and of the International Labour Office; the majority of these plans concern the agricultural countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

"The Committee expresses the hope that the League of Nations, the Commission of Inquiry for European Union and the forthcoming World Economic Conference will adopt the decisions and take the measures necessary for the realisation, as speedily as possible, of the plans for public works answering to the needs outlined above, and particularly those which are in course of execution and run the risk of being interrupted for lack of capital."

This sentiment is repeated in the recommendations adopted by the Conference, where it is expressed as follows:

"The Committee recommends . . .

"10. The adoption of a programme of public works for improving economic conditions in Central and Eastern Europe, and particularly the disposal of agricultural products."

The report of the Stresa Conference was submitted to the Committee of Inquiry for European Union at the Session of that body which opened on 30 September. It will also be submitted to the coming World Economic and Financial Conference.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION AND THE ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

As stated in the *Monthly Summary of the League of Nations*, on 27 September, 1932, the Council of the League examined the question of the meeting of the Commission of Experts to prepare the coming World Economic and Financial Conference.

Mr. Paul-Boncour (France) recalled that at a former meeting it had been agreed that the International Labour Office should place its technical services at the disposal of the Commission of Experts and that the Committee of the Council should have the power to enlarge the Commission. Mr. Paul-Boncour expressed the opinion that it would be advisable immediately to associate the workers' organisations represented in the International Labour Organisation with the work of preparing the Conference.

Mr. de Madariaga (Spain) also spoke in favour of Mr. Paul-Boncour's suggestion.

Mr. Eden (Great Britain), reporter to the Council on the question, stated that the Committee of the Council, which was to meet on 3 October, would not fail to examine the question if, as he imagined, the representative of France then raised it.

The reporter's proposal was adopted.

THE EGYPTIAN PRIME MINISTER VISITS THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Sidky Pasha, the Prime Minister of Egypt, visited the International Labour Office on 15 September and was received by the Director, Mr. H. B. Butler. Their conversation turned chiefly on the Egyptian Government's plans for social legislation. It will be remembered that after his visit to Egypt last February, Mr. Butler, at the request of the Egyptian Government, submitted a report on the present conditions in industry in that country and the best methods of organising a Department of Labour. The present interview was concerned chiefly with the practical steps to be taken for applying the suggestions contained in that report.

Mr. Butler showed Sidky Pasha round the Office and explained to him the working of the various services.

VIII.—PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

PETITION FROM REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
DESCENDANTS OF THE FORMER SZEKLER
FRONTIER GUARD REGIMENT.

In May, 1932, the Council decided that its rapporteur, the Japanese representative, assisted by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Norway, should enter into negotiations with the Roumanian Government with a view to finding a practical solution of the problem raised by the petition from the representatives of the descendants of the former Szekler Frontier Guard Regiment.*

The task of this Committee of Three being to find a practical solution to the question, the legal aspect was eliminated from its study.

Until 1923 there existed in the district of Ciuc (Transylvania) a property consisting of approximately 45,500 arpents† of forest, 17,000 arpents of pasture and arable land, and certain buildings in the town of Mercurea Ciuc and in other towns in the Ciuc district. This property was employed, in the form of an autonomous administration (Administration of Ciuc Property), for the upkeep of certain educational and charitable institutions for the benefit of a section of the Hungarian population of the country consisting of the descendants of members of the former Szekler (Hungarian) Frontier Guard Regiment.

In 1923 the Roumanian State, taking the view that it was the owner of that property, in its capacity as Successor State to the Hungarian State, took possession of it, and in virtue of the Agrarian Reform, a considerable part of the forest and pasture land (about 32,000 arpents) was distributed to ten communes in the form of communal property, and, either to churches or to peasants, in the form of individual lots. The rest of the land (approximately 30,000 arpents), however, remained in the possession of the State. As regards the buildings, it was decided to instal in them various public administrations, while some were to be used for their original purposes, particularly those housing the educational or charitable institutions which until 1923 had been kept up by the Administration of the Property.

The Committee considered first the possi-

bility of arriving at a practical solution by applying to the Roumanian Government for the entire restitution of that part of the property which had remained in its possession or for the payment of compensation. The negotiations carried on with the representatives of the Government convinced the Committee, however, that in the present circumstances it was neither expedient nor practical to proceed on these lines.

On the other hand, the Committee realised the possibility of arriving at a solution, on the basis of a partial restitution of the former property and acceptance by the Roumanian State of part of the charges previously borne by the former Administration of the Ciuc Property.

Proposals on this basis were drawn up by the Committee and considered by the Council at its meeting of September 27th.

In submitting them to the Council, the Japanese representative pointed out that the solution proposed by the Committee of Three did not settle the legal claims raised by the petitioners, but that it was such as to safeguard the legitimate interests of the minority in so far as consonant with the supreme interests of the State.

He expressed the Council's gratitude to the Roumanian representative who, during the negotiations, had always shown a conciliatory and friendly spirit.

M. Antoniadé (Roumania), who was present at the Council table, stated on behalf of his Government that he unreservedly accepted the Japanese representative's report. He added that the results achieved showed how happy had been the Council's decision to leave on one side the very difficult legal aspects of the problem and to seek a practical solution. The solution reached was fair, equitable and practical, and was calculated to safeguard all the interests involved.

The Council, after adopting the Japanese representative's report and approving the proposals contained therein, noted the Roumanian Government's acceptance, and declared the examination of this question closed.

IX.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL FROM THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

On August 11th the Japanese Government, in a communication to the Secretary-General,

* See Monthly Summary, May, 1932, page 163.

† An arpent=0.575 hectares.

stated that it had appointed an extraordinary Ambassador, General Muto, to co-ordinate the various Japanese institutions in Manchuria, taking into account the "new and actual state of affairs" in that territory.

On September 16th the Japanese representative on the Council announced that his Government had on the previous day concluded with the Manchukuo Government a Protocol granting that State its formal recognition. On September 17th the Chinese representative, in a note to the President of the Extraordinary Assembly, protested against the official recognition of Manchukuo by Japan—a measure which set the seal upon her “policy of tearing up treaties.” The Chinese representative requested the President to hasten the action of the League in devising measures appropriate to uphold respect for the decisions taken by the Extraordinary Assembly; he recalled that the President had on July 1st solemnly declared that the parties should abstain from any action that might compromise the success of the work of the Commission of Inquiry.*

The Commission of Inquiry, over which Lord Lytton presided, returned from Japan to Peking on July 20th and there drafted its report. On September 4th the English text of this report was signed by the members of the Commission. The document reached Geneva on September 22nd.

A week earlier, on September 14th, the Japanese Government had asked the Council that a minimum period of six weeks should be allowed to elapse after the receipt of the report in order to permit it to prepare “observations” which would be brought to Geneva by a “qualified person.” He also expressed the wish that the Council should not consider the report until after receipt of the Japanese Government’s observations.

On September 24th the Council considered Japan’s request.

The President, Mr. de Valera, said that if the request were acceded to a further delay in the meeting of the Assembly and of its Committee of Nineteen would become inevitable. The Committee of Nineteen had expressed the hope that it would be able to begin the study of the necessary documentation by November 1st at the latest, whereas the Council would now scarcely be able to begin its discussion until after the middle of November. The Council would, however, have acceded ungrudgingly to the request had it not felt a certain regret that before the discussion of the report, before even the publication of the report, Japan had, by

recognising the Manchukuo Government, taken steps which could not but be regarded as calculated to prejudice the settlement of the dispute. For almost a year the Council and the individual Governments which compose it had refrained from uttering any word of judgment on the merits of this grave dispute, on the grounds that a Commission had been set up to investigate it in all its bearings. In spite of this regret the President proposed that the Council should agree in principle to the Japanese proposal.

The Japanese representative, M. Nagaoka, asked the Council to bear in mind the position with regard to communications between Japan and Europe and not to decide upon too strict a time-limit. Since all questions connected with the Sino-Japanese issue should be taken together, he would refrain from discussing the question of the recognition of the State of Manchukuo.

The Chinese representative, M. Yen, was surprised that Japan required a six weeks’ period to submit its observations on the report. He added that he would have less hesitation in acceding to the request for further delay were he certain that Japan would not take advantage of the opportunity to aggravate the situation.

By its resolution of July 1st, the Assembly had decided to prolong the six months’ period provided for in Article 12 of the Covenant for the settlement of a dispute “to the extent that may be strictly necessary.” The precise period of the extension must be fixed by the Assembly, on the proposal of its Special Committee, after the receipt of the Commission of Inquiry’s report. Hope had been expressed in the resolution that the date for the examination of this report by the Committee of Nineteen would not be fixed later than November 1st. If the Council were to adopt a proposal which would in any way prejudge the fixing of the period, such proposal must be considered by the Assembly itself. M. Yen pointed out that the matter had been taken out of the Council’s hands from the moment the dispute had been brought before the Extraordinary Assembly. In conclusion he asked that the Japanese Government’s request should be referred to the Special Committee of the Assembly.

The President replied to the legal objections raised by the Chinese representative. Certainly, he said, reference of the Sino-Japanese dispute to the Assembly limited the Council’s powers, but these restrictions did not appear to diminish the Council’s right to decide to discuss a report for which it had asked.

At the close of the discussion, during which further observations were submitted by the

* On September 20th the Secretary-General informed the Members of the Council that he had received two telegrams from Shangshun dated September 15th and signed “Ksich Chieh-shih, Foreign Minister of Manchukuo.” As he did not feel qualified to take any action on these communications he had had them placed in the archives of the Secretariat.

Chinese representatives and the President as well as by the Spanish representative, the Council decided to comply with the Japanese Government's request. It was pointed out that the report of the Commission of Inquiry would be printed with all possible speed, so that it might be sent to the Members of the Council by October 1st. It was, however, to be despatched without maps or annexes, which would be published later.*

The Council agreed in principle to meet on November 14th, or by November 21st at latest, to begin its consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry and of any observations received from the Japanese Government.

Two days later, on September 26th, M. Yen, in a letter addressed to the President of the Special Committee, asked that this Committee should be convened to consider and decide on the duration of the extension of the six months' period. The Chinese Government, he said, placed much importance on the fixing of the duration of this period, which it hoped would be as short as possible. At the same time he begged the Special Committee to take the necessary steps to prevent Japan from taking advantage of any delay to aggravate the situation. The Special Committee considered the Chinese representative's request on October 1st.

2. DISPUTE BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY.

In June and July, 1932, while the Bolivian and Paraguayan delegates were still engaged at Washington, under the auspices of the "Commission of Neutrals" (United States of America, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico and Uruguay), in conducting the negotiations which had been commenced several months previously with a view to the conclusion of a bilateral pact of non-aggression, further serious incidents occurred in the territory of the Northern Chaco, the Government of each country throwing the blame for the aggression on the troops of the other.

This situation was first brought to the notice of the Secretary-General in a letter from the delegate of Bolivia, M. Costa du Rels, dated July 21st. After reporting a Paraguayan attack on July 15th against the Bolivian Santa Cruz outpost (region of Laguna Grande, in the department of Chuquisaca), and the coincidence of this aggression with the withdrawal of the Paraguayan representatives from the Washington Conference, the Bolivian delegate added :

"Lest any erroneous interpretation might subsequently be placed on this occurrence, I desire to inform you of the truly regrettable circumstances of such an act, in order that the facts may be seen in their true light."

To these Bolivian accusations, the Paraguayan Government replied on July 27th that the attack of July 15th had been launched, not against the Santa Cruz outpost, but more than 100 kilometres to the south-west, against the Carlos Antonio Lopez outpost. This latter Paraguayan outpost had been taken by the Bolivian troops on July 15th, and retaken by the Paraguayan troops on the 19th.

The Paraguayan Government also accused Bolivia of having, during the Washington negotiations, constructed some ten new outposts in the Chaco in such a way as to confront Paraguay with accomplished facts and be able, in case of need, if Paraguay reacted in defence, to present herself as the victim of an aggression. It was in view of these facts that Paraguay had decided, on July 9th, 1932, to withdraw her delegates from the Washington Conference. In response, however, to representations made by the Commission of Neutrals, she had revoked that decision on July 20th, so that the Paraguayan delegation was still at Washington ready to engage in any useful negotiations. Being convinced of the soundness of her claim, Paraguay would appeal, with the object of settling her dispute with Bolivia, only to those pacific means which international justice offered.

The President-in-Office of the Council, M. Matos, having noted these two communications, sent the following letter to the Secretary-General on July 29th :

"... It appears from information in my possession that several American nations are continuing their efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement. I am sure that all my fellow-members of the Council are with me in hoping that those efforts may be crowned with success. Inasmuch as the present situation is one which might disturb the peace or the good understanding between two Members of the League, the other Members cannot regard the development of this situation with indifference. I should therefore be grateful if you would bring this letter to the notice of the delegates of Bolivia and Paraguay and request them to inform their Governments that the President-in-Office of the Council, who happens to be also a citizen of an American Republic, is anxiously watching developments in this matter, and that he begs them to lend all possible assistance to the other American Republics which are endeavouring to restore a peaceful atmosphere, in the spirit of the Covenant of our League."

On July 30th, the Paraguayan delegate, M. Caballero y Bedoya, communicated to the Secretary-General, for information, a telegram

* The report was distributed to the Press on October 2nd, at 1 p.m.

which his Government had despatched to him on the 29th. This telegram stated that an attack by a Bolivian patrol had been repulsed near the Paraguayan Colonel Bogado outpost (Bahia Negra area), that this new attack had been represented by Bolivia as a Paraguayan attack on an alleged "Florida" outpost, the existence of which was unknown, that two Bolivian military aeroplanes had flown, on the 28th, over the Boquerón outpost, and that the Paraguayan garrison of the Corrales outpost had retreated before superior Bolivian forces. The Paraguayan delegate added that Bolivia had just refused to appear at Washington in response to the appeal of the Commission of Neutrals, who, with a view to the peaceful settlement of the conflict, asked that an undertaking might be given to refrain from any hostile act which might aggravate or extend the dispute. The Government of Paraguay, for its part, responding to that appeal, had instructed all the military commanders of the outposts in the Chaco to remain strictly on the defensive.

On August 1st, the President-in-Office of the Council sent to Bolivia and Paraguay a telegram in which he reminded them that, on the occasion of the incidents of December, 1928, concerning the Chaco, the Council, under the presidency of M. Briand, had obtained from the two Governments a solemn promise to have recourse to a procedure of pacific settlement in conformity with the Covenant, and also to take urgent measures to prevent fresh incidents liable to compromise the success of any pacific procedure. Relying on this precedent and being certain that he interpreted the feelings of all the members of the Council, the President continued :

"I address an urgent appeal to the two Governments that they lend themselves, as in 1928, to the moderating action of friendly nations, and, respecting the undertakings which bind Members of the League of Nations, seek the settlement of their dispute without departing from peaceful methods."*

On the same day (August 1st), the Paraguayan Minister for Foreign Affairs telegraphed to the President-in-Office of the Council to draw his attention to military hostilities against his country without any previous demand for explanations or declaration of war, the last of these acts being the capture of the Paraguayan Toledo outpost (July 29th), the bombing by

air of the Colonel Martinez outpost and Isla Poi, and the artillery attack on the Boquerón outpost (July 31st). Paraguay denounced this as an express breach of Articles 10 and 11 of the Covenant, adding that she had always been and continued to be prepared to submit the dispute with Bolivia to arbitration, that she had accepted the invitation of the Commission of Neutrals for an international investigation of the events of June 15th and 29th and July 15th, and that those were the circumstances in which the military hostilities which she was notifying to the President were taking place.

On August 2nd, the President-in-Office of the Council communicated this telegram to the Bolivian Government for its information, adding :

"I would draw your particular attention to the statement of the Paraguayan Government that it has been and remains disposed to submit the dispute with Bolivia to arbitration. Under Article 12 of the Covenant, arbitration is one of the alternative procedures to which all Members of the League have agreed to submit any dispute likely to lead to a rupture. I should be grateful to be informed as soon as possible, for the information of the Council, what is the method of pacific settlement contemplated by your Government."

On August 3rd, both Governments replied to the President's telegram of August 1st. The Paraguayan Government said that it had given repeated proofs of its intention to settle the boundary question with Bolivia by legal means. "It is Bolivia," the Paraguayan Government asserted, "who is bringing about this war of aggression, which is unjustified both morally and legally."

The Bolivian Government, in reply to the President's telegrams of August 1st and 2nd, gave the Council the following information : On June 29th, Paraguayan forces had attacked the Bolivian outpost at the Chuquisaca Lagoon. Whereas, notwithstanding this attack, Bolivia remained at the Washington Conference, Paraguay withdrew her delegates and renewed her attack in the Lagoon with strong forces on July 15th. She then informed the Commission of Neutrals that she would return to the Washington Conference. On July 25th, the Bolivian Florida outpost—the existence of which could be proved—was attacked by fifty Paraguayan soldiers. In view of these repeated attacks, the Bolivians, by way of reprisals, took three Paraguayan outposts. It was, moreover, incorrect that Paraguay had accepted an investigation of the events of June 15th and 29th. It was after the second attack on July 15th that she had offered to return to the Washington Conference, when the situation had already

* Representations at Asunción and La Paz in support of the intervention on the part of the President-in-Office of the Council were made by the Spanish Government, which informed the Secretary-General of the fact telegraphically on August 3rd, and by other Governments.

substantially altered, and Bolivia, who was the victim of the first outrage, could not calmly return to Washington after the second. Paraguay had repeated the attack of 1928, and, this time, Bolivia had been forced to arrest any action by Paraguay on a larger scale in order to limit its consequences. The telegram from the Bolivian Minister for Foreign Affairs concluded :

"In response to the League's appeal, my Government declares that it does not reject pacific means based on the settlement of the dispute within the express limitations placed on the good offices of the neutrals."

The above telegram from the Bolivian Government was communicated on August 4th by the President-in-Office of the Council to the Paraguayan Government for its information. The President of the Council added :

"I would specially draw your attention to the final sentence of the Bolivian telegram. In view of the desire for a pacific settlement, also expressed in Your Excellency's telegram of August 1st, it seems that the way is open to agreement on a method of settlement that will enable the undertakings in the League Covenant to be observed."

On the same day the President of the Council telegraphed to the Bolivian Government :

"The last sentence of your telegram, in conjunction with the sentence of the telegram from Paraguay dated August 1st, to which I had directed your special attention, justifies, I think, the assumption that the two nations desire a pacific settlement. It seems that the way is open to agreement on a method of settlement permitting of the observance of the undertakings of the League Covenant."

After this exchange of telegrams, the two Governments continued, during August, to send various communications to the Secretary-General.

On August 5th, the delegate of Paraguay stated once more, on behalf of his Government, that his country was prepared to have recourse to arbitration, and that, as it had not as yet been possible to reach any agreement on the subject of the dispute, Paraguay agreed to entrust to the arbitrators the framing of an agreement of reference. Such arbitration, proceeding by successive stages, dealing first with the agreement of reference which would determine the specific subject of the dispute—that was, the contested zone—and then with the question which party had the best claim to that zone, had already, on September 9th, 1929, been proposed by the Paraguayan delegation to the Bolivo-Paraguayan Commission of Inquiry and Conciliation at Washington.

On August 6th the Paraguayan delegate informed the Secretary-General that Bolivian

aircraft, without any previous declaration of war, had, during the previous week, repeatedly bombarded, not only Paraguayan outposts within the Chaco, but also Mennonite colonies. On the same day, in reply to the telegram sent by the President of the Council on August 4th, the Paraguayan Government said that all America realised that Bolivia had committed an act of aggression in attacking the Carlos Antonio Lopez outpost on July 15th, and confirmed its statement that Paraguay had always been, and was still, prepared to seek a solution of the dispute by arbitration or other legal means. On August 8th, the delegate of Paraguay stated that his Government had, on August 5th, accepted the proposals of the American countries recommending the suspension of hostilities and a return to the *status quo* of June 1st. He added that Bolivia had thought fit to reject these suggestions. Bolivia agreed to an armistice only on condition that she might keep the outposts which she had taken from Paraguay.

For its part, the Bolivian Government, after its delegate had, on August 12th, denied the capture of the Paraguayan Carlos Antonio Lopez outpost and consequently its alleged recapture by Paraguayan troops, complained of a Paraguayan attack, made on August 9th, on the Bolivian Tejerina outpost. On August 13th, the Bolivian delegate announced that, in response to the friendly request of the Commission of Neutrals sitting at Washington, his country had agreed to suspend the hostilities which she had been conducting in the Chaco to defend herself against the Paraguayan aggression of July 15th. The Bolivian Government hoped that, meanwhile, the Commission of Neutrals would be able, on the basis of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to find a solution for the Chaco problem which would be rapid and equitable as well as final.

In subsequent communications (August 18th and 19th) the Bolivian delegate notified the Secretary-General of two further incidents (attack on the Bolivian Huijay outpost on August 15th; attack on the Caraya outpost on August 17th).

On the other hand, in a communication dated August 20th, the Paraguayan delegate pointed out that all the countries of America had subscribed to a declaration renouncing the acquisition of territory by conquest, and had communicated it to Bolivia and Paraguay. He added that his country had immediately accepted this declaration, but that Bolivia had not done so.

Subsequently, in the early days of September, Press reports indicated a further aggravation

of the situation. On September 10th, the President-in-Office of the Council requested the Secretary-General to transmit a new appeal to the Governments of the two countries. In this communication, M. Matos reminded the parties that, after their Governments had confirmed that they intended to seek pacific settlement of their dispute in conformity with the undertakings to which they had subscribed in the Covenant of the League of Nations, he had, in his telegram to them of August 4th, felt himself able to note that the way was open to agreement on a method of settlement. He added :

" Since then, efforts which we have observed with satisfaction and confidence have been made in America to arrive at a pacific solution. Recently, however, public opinion has been disturbed by Press reports indicating that matters have become much worse. I hope that the two Governments will shortly communicate for the information of my colleagues on the Council and the Members of the League the measures they intend to take to put an end to a situation which is a danger to peace. Although I cannot doubt that the undertakings to seek a pacific solution embodied in the Covenant will be fulfilled, I should be very glad if you would inform the two Governments that we hope shortly to receive reassuring information. I would ask you to add that I consider it my duty, as President-in-Office of the Council, to remind them that they have undertaken solemnly to observe their obligations as Members of the League."

On September 12th the Paraguayan Government replied to this appeal, pointing out that the Commission of Neutrals had been continuing its mediation, for which reason Paraguay had refrained from having recourse to the League. The Paraguayan Government added :

" We have accepted all procedures proposed to avoid armed conflict, as well as arbitration or the jurisdiction of the Hague Court, to solve the dispute. To-day, we are informing the neutrals of our readiness to accept a suspension of hostilities. We believe Paraguay has strictly complied with her obligations as a Member of the League and of the community of civilised nations."

In his reply, dated September 13th, the Bolivian Minister for Foreign Affairs stated :

" I have the honour to inform you that my Government accepted the truce proposed by the neutrals, which Paraguay caused to fail by making unacceptable demands. At present, Bolivia is standing on the defensive, the cessation of hostilities not lying in her hands. I have just replied to neutrals that this Government reiterates its acceptance of the truce in order to seek fundamental solutions."

The Secretary-General, for purposes of information, communicated the Bolivian telegram to the Paraguayan Government and the Paraguayan telegram to the Bolivian Government.

On September 16th the Paraguayan Government telegraphed that it had confined itself to demanding that " the suspension of hostilities would conform to the principles of international law, and provide effective guarantees that it would constitute the first step in the establishment of peace and not simply a stoppage for the purpose of completing warlike preparations."

At the Council meeting of September 23rd M. Matos (Guatemala) informed his colleagues of the various steps which he had taken since the last session as President in Office of the Council. He first recalled the efforts made by the Committee of Neutrals and by the neighbouring Powers to the countries concerned with a view to settling the dispute. He drew attention to the declaration made on August 3rd by the nineteen American Republics asking that the dispute might immediately be submitted to arbitration or some other method of peaceful settlement, and adding that they would recognise no territorial arrangement which had not been brought about by peaceful means. He suggested that the Council should declare that it was ready to further the efforts of the American Republics to bring about a peaceful settlement. If the Council accepted this proposal the Secretary-General might be requested to bring his declaration to the notice of the Republics in question.

The Spanish representative, M. de Madariaga, approved the action taken by the Acting President during the interval between the Council sessions. Since the Covenant was the only legal instrument which could bring the two countries to have recourse to peaceful methods, the responsibility for taking such steps rested with the Council. He therefore proposed that, in view of the degree of responsibility incumbent on it under Article 11, and probably under Article 10, too, of the Covenant, the Council should appoint either a rapporteur or a small committee of three members to follow the question closely and, if need be, to request the other parties concerned to send the Council all necessary information.

M. Paul-Boncour (France) agreed with the Spanish representative. Whenever a dispute broke out between two countries bound by the Covenant, such an occurrence, in whatever part of the world it took place, was a reverse for the League; consequently the Council must do everything in its power to terminate the dispute.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) associated himself with the substance of the observations

made by the Spanish and French representatives.

M. Garay (Panama) said that he was in full agreement with the previous speakers. He pointed out that when, in December last, the Council was discussing at Paris the question of the Far East, the three Latin-American representatives had made declarations which definitely bound them.

After hearing the President, Mr. de Valera, the Council approved the steps taken by M. Matos and M. de Madariaga's suggestion, and on September 27th requested a Committee composed of the President in Office, Mr. de Valera, the former President of the Council, M. Matos, and the Spanish representative, to follow the development of events. The Council at the same time decided to send to the Bolivian and Paraguayan Governments the following telegram:

"Council has noted with full approval action taken by Monsieur Matos in its name during period when it was not in session. It now addresses to the two Governments solemn reminder that they are legally and honourably bound by their obligations to League not to have recourse armed force to settle unhappy dispute which has arisen between them but to refer it either to arbitration judicial settlement or to Council.

"Council observes that certain American Republics are doing their best assist Parties in reaching amicable settlement. It welcomes and supports these endeavours and earnestly requests the two Governments to accept them and put immediate stop military action and preparation. Such decision by the two Governments will constitute honourable and effective fulfilment of the engagements which they have undertaken towards all other Members League. Council feels convinced that both Governments as original Members of League will duly fulfil those engagements and anxiously awaits assurances to this effect."

On September 27th the Paraguayan Government replied that it had put forth its best endeavours to solve the dispute by declaring to the Committee of Neutrals at Washington its decision to accept conciliation and arbitration procedures on the broadest basis. The telegram continued:

"For the purpose of these procedures it proposed to Committee of Neutrals total withdrawal of troops from the Chaco, and reduction of military effectives to minimum compatible with the internal security of each country under international supervision with a view to removing danger further war and insuring a pacific settlement of the dispute. My country is prepared to put an end to the struggle as soon as it has obtained assurances further clashes will be avoided and efforts made to seek a solution of the question by international justice."

The reply from the Bolivian Government, dated September 28th, reads:

"I have the honour to state that Bolivia was prepared at any time to settle the territorial dispute regarding the Chaco by direct agreement or by judicial arbitration. Bolivia has, as always, done everything in her power to stop the conflict. In the reply, dated the 13th instant, sent to the President of the Council of the League of Nations, my Government stated that it had accepted the truce proposed by the neutrals, but that the suspension of hostilities did not depend on its own action, in view of the Paraguayan offensive, which has never stopped to this day. For the rest the case will continue to be dealt with by the good offices of the neutral Governments."

On September 30th the President in Office of the Council sent to the Committee of Neutrals at Washington a telegram informing it that the Council had set up a Committee to follow the course of the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay. It informed the Committee of the Council's desire "to give all possible support to the endeavours of the Neutrals Committee, which are directed towards securing decisive action in the sense of the pacific declarations made by both parties," and of its hope "that your Committee will keep me informed of the steps which it is taking and of the development of the situation, in order that the Council, in discharge of its responsibilities, may give that support in the most effective manner."

On the same day the Committee of Neutrals replied through its President, Mr. Francis White, that it welcomed the valuable support offered by the League Council, and would have pleasure in informing that Committee of further developments in the matter.

"The cause of peace and of the peaceful settlement of international disputes will be greatly advanced by the reconciliation of the belligerents and the preparation of the bases of a just arbitration which the Commission of Neutrals hopes to bring about. Any remarks your Committee may care to convey to the Commission of Neutrals will receive careful and sympathetic consideration."

On September 27th, during the general discussion in the Assembly, the Paraguayan representative, M. Caballero y Bedoya, announced that his Government acceded wholeheartedly and unreservedly to the setting up of the Committee of the Council. He repeated that Paraguay was willing to accept the proposal to refer the matter to arbitration with a view to the framing of an agreement.

On the following day the Bolivian delegate, M. Costa du Rels, said that the creation of the Committee would give rise to a feeling of relief in his country. After stating that Bolivia possessed over that part of its territory bounded

on the east by the River Paraguay rights ensuing from an inviolable, irrefutable principle of American law, he added that his country had suffered too much from war not to be ready to accept a pacific solution, but such a solution must be permanent and secure and in the spirit of the Covenant of the League.

M. Caballero y Bedoya replied, noting the declaration made by M. Costa du Rels.

The President, M. Politis, on behalf of the Assembly, noted the declarations made as to the firm intentions of the two Governments to submit their dispute to procedure for pacific settlement. This procedure thus accepted by both parties, he expressed his conviction that peace between the two countries, which had been troubled for a brief spell, would be permanently restored.

X.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

I. PERMANENT CENTRAL OPIUM BOARD.

The Permanent Central Opium Board held its thirteenth session at Geneva from August 15th to September 1st, 1932, Mr. Lyall (United Kingdom) presiding.*

Its main discussions bore on the following points: relations between the supervisory body provided for in the Convention on the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs and the Central Board; definition of the term "consumption"; establishment of statistics on a uniform basis; statistical tables and graphs to be annexed to the report to the Council; discrepancy tables; comparative tables for the examination of the quarterly statistics for the first quarter of 1932.

During this session the Board also prepared its annual report, which was discussed by the Council at its meeting of September 23rd.† This document gives the conclusions reached by the Board after close study of the statistics supplied to it, in accordance with the provisions of Article 25 of the Convention, by forty-seven Governments parties to the Convention and by a certain number of other States which have not adhered thereto.

It shows that the world manufacture of the three main drugs—morphine, heroin and cocaine—has steadily decreased between 1929 and 1931. The Board emphasised that it has not been able to take into account manufacture in Turkey or in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as these countries had supplied no documentation. In spite of these lacunæ the quantities of morphine, heroin and cocaine manufactured in 1931 are appreciably less than the estimates made by the Secretariat last year of the maximum world requirements of these drugs for medical purposes.

The Board further notes that the activities of traffickers, judged by the quantities of drugs

seized, seemed to have diminished in 1931, adding, however, that too much importance should not be attached to it.

With a view to the entry into force of the 1931 Convention on Limitation, the Board adopted a resolution which was ratified by the Council. This resolution specifies that accurate and complete statistical reports on the world-wide movement of narcotic drugs provide one of the best regulatory devices for this movement. It recalls that, in the Geneva Convention of 1925, there is a certain number of statistical loop-holes, which are filled up by the provisions of the Limitation Convention of 1931, and that, owing to this, the work of the Board will be made much more effective when the Limitation Convention comes into force. Lastly, it lays emphasis on the necessity for prompt ratification and accession by a number of countries in order that the 1931 Convention on Limitation may be brought into effect.

The rapporteur to the Council, the Yugoslav representative, recalled that he had at a previous session informed the Council of the Opium Advisory Committee's decision that the attention of Governments should be drawn to the importance of their proceeding as soon as possible to the ratification of the Convention. On his proposal the Council decided to refer the Central Board's resolution to the Assembly.

The Permanent Central Board's report, the conclusions of which have been forwarded by the Council to the Assembly, finally calls attention to certain differences of opinion between the Board and a Government, a party to the Convention, which the discussion at the Council revealed to be the German Government, with regard to the way in which the statistics compiled by the Board are at present made public.

With reference to this situation, M. Gallavresi, the representative of the Permanent Central Opium Board, stated at the Council meeting of September 23rd that the Board would, at its

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 1, page 31.

† Rapporteur: the Yugoslav representative.

next session, go into the question of these objections with a representative of that Government.

Baron von Neurath, the German representative, said that his Government's point of view should not be interpreted as a change in its attitude towards the campaign against the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs; his Government would continue to collaborate fully in that campaign and would, further, ratify the 1931 Convention.

The Italian and French representatives, Baron Aloisi and M. Paul-Boncour, announced that the Convention was in course of ratification by their respective Chambers.

2. GIFT OFFERED BY MR. A. E. BLANCO, DIRECTOR OF THE ANTI-OPIMUM INFORMATION BUREAU, GENEVA.

At its meeting on September 23rd the Council considered a note from the Secretary-General regarding a gift from Mr. A. E. Blanco, Director of the Anti-Opium Information Bureau, to the League of £100 sterling to be used to defray part of the cost of preparing and printing an index of the minutes of the Conference for the limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs.

The rapporteur, M. Matos (Guatemala), pointed out to the Council that Mr. Blanco's gift would involve the League in fresh expenditure which could only be accepted subject to the authorisation of the Assembly, inasmuch as the cost of preparing and printing the index would amount to seven thousand Swiss francs. The League would thus incur 75 per cent. of the expenditure which the donor wished it to undertake.

While fully appreciating Mr. Blanco's generosity, the Council felt that it could not accept his gift. In view, however, of the value of an index to the minutes of the Conference in question, the Council asked the Secretary-General to consult the Fourth Committee of the Assembly in order that the latter might take a decision on the budgetary aspect of the question.

3. COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON SLAVERY.

The Committee of Experts on Slavery, set up under the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1931, held its second session at Geneva from August 22nd to 30th.*

During this session the Committee prepared its report, which was communicated to the Council. The Council at its meeting on September 23rd decided to forward this report to the Assembly.†

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 172.

† Rapporteur: the United Kingdom representative.

The report reviews slavery in its various aspects (with the exception, however, of public or private forced labour and the situation in Liberia), permitting of a comparison between the situation in 1924 and that at present existing. It deals with the position and legal status of slavery, slave-raiding and similar acts, the slave trade, slave-dealing (including transfer by exchange, sale, gift, inheritance or occasional sale of persons previously free); practices restrictive of the liberty of the person; domestic or predial slavery (serfdom), transition from servile or compulsory labour to free-wage labour and independent production. The account of each of the aspects of the problem is accompanied by the suggestions put forward by the Committee.

The experts have reached the following conclusions:

(a) Slave-raiding in the old form of vast organised operations such as still existed only thirty years ago in Africa has completely disappeared under the combined efforts of the European Colonial Powers.

At intervals, especially on the frontiers of certain possessions or of States such as Abyssinia, in districts where the authority of the Central Government does not yet make itself sufficiently felt, there still occur individual or collective acts aiming at the capture of free men in order to keep them as slaves or dispose of them subsequently. The number of such acts is declining from year to year. They are, moreover, severely punished by Abyssinian law (death penalty). The experts feel that a closer and more active liaison between the Powers concerned will no doubt finally put an end to such practices.

(b) The chief object of these captures is to supply the slave markets which still exist in certain Arab States on the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. In the opinion of the experts, the first objective of the League of Nations should be to secure the abolition of this trade.

(c) Some States, chiefly the Moslem States of Arabia, have not yet abolished slavery either in law or in fact. The experts feel that the League of Nations should exercise its influence here, and not admit any such State to its membership unless it accepts obligations identical with those entered into by Abyssinia in 1923. European Powers, in concluding treaties with these States, should endeavour to secure the insertion of a clause aiming at the same object.

(d) Abyssinia, a Christian State, has not yet abolished slavery in law or in fact, but has, in accordance with its undertakings, enacted

successive measures aiming at preventing the enslavement of persons who are at present free and gradually diminishing the number of those who are still slaves. The experts recommend that the League should follow the progress made, and ensure that it continues unabated.

(e) In the countries which have abolished slavery there still exist in Africa certain types of social status in which men are not in enjoyment of full civil freedom, but which are in no sense inhuman and which in some respects present even advantages (assistance to the sick and infirm). Such forms of social status have been abolished by law in the territories controlled by colonial Powers, and are disappearing under the influence of various factors. According to the French, Italian and Portuguese experts, such kinds of social status do not come under the definition of slavery as laid down in the 1926 Convention. According to the Belgian, British, Spanish and Netherlands experts, these kinds of social status do come within that definition, if they involve the exercise by the master of any of the attributes of the right of property.

(f) In certain districts of Africa and Asia, and even America, practices incompatible with human liberty still seem to exist. They take numerous forms and vary from country to country. According to the experts such practices (pawning of debtors, peonage, simulated adoption of children, etc.), pending their abolition by custom, should be prohibited by law.

After this general review of the situation, the Committee of Experts, in the last chapter of its report, replies to the questions asked by the Council.

Answering the first question: "To what extent has the 1926 Convention succeeded in

putting an end to slavery, what obstacles stand in the way of fresh progress in this direction?" the Committee considered that, though showing substantial improvement, the documentation supplied did not permit of a formal reply.

On the second question: "By what methods could assistance be rendered to States desirous of receiving it with the object of putting an end to slavery within their territory?" the Committee observed that help of this kind had been requested only by Liberia. In view of the fact that a special committee of the Council had been constituted to study questions regarding this country the experts deemed it proper to refrain from making any suggestions in the matter.

In reply to the third question: "Whether it was desirable to make any modifications in the existing machinery of the League?" the Committee considered:

(a) That a special bureau should be responsible for receiving and, if possible, completing the documentation and for classifying it.

(b) That a small permanent committee should be appointed to work upon the documentation collected by the bureau and to inform world public opinion as to the state of slavery, thus promoting the development of ideas which might lead to the abolition of slavery in all its forms.

In reply to the fourth question: "What measures can the Committee suggest in order to bring about the ratification of or accession to the 1926 Convention by States which have not already done this?" the Committee could suggest no other means than to recall at each successive session of the Assembly the existence of this Convention and the value of its ratification or accession thereto, if only to bring moral force to bear in the campaign against slavery.

XI.—OBITUARY.

I. TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF COUNT GRAVINA.

The Council at its meeting of September 23rd, at which M. Ferber, representative of the Free City of Danzig, was present, paid a tribute to the memory of Count Gravina, League High Commissioner in Danzig.

The President, Mr. de Valera (Irish Free State), recalled Count Gravina's career who since 1929 had represented the League at Danzig. "As a former soldier and diplomatist," he said, "Count Gravina brought to the task entrusted to him the qualities of those professions—courage and tact. In the performance of his duties, he not only displayed these professional

qualities, but also contributed the personal qualities of kindness and a keen and lucid intelligence. . . . As High Commissioner of the League at Danzig he devoted to that arduous task all his energy and all his strength. . . . His death deprives the League of one of its most devoted servants."

The meeting was suspended for a few moments as a mark of respect, after which Baron Aloisi, the Italian representative, thanked the President of the Council in the name of his Government for the honour done to Count Gravina's memory.

2. TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF M. CLAN.

The Council at its meeting of September 23rd

paid a tribute to the memory of M. Clan (Denmark). M. von Neurath, the German representative, recalled that M. Clan had for years past taken part in the economic work of the League, both as a member of the Advisory Committee and as his country's delegate to various international conferences held under League auspices.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE COURT.

On August 11th, 1932, the Twenty-fifth (Extraordinary) Session of the Court, which had opened on April 18th, 1932, was declared closed.

This session had been devoted to the case concerning the Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex (Judgment of June 7th, 1932), to the Memel Case (Judgments of June 24th and August 11th, 1932), and the case concerning South-Eastern Greenland (Order of August 3rd, 1932).

2. INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE OF MEMEL.

On August 11th, 1932, the Court delivered its judgment in the dispute concerning the interpretation of the Statute of the Territory of Memel. This dispute was between the signatories of the Convention of May 8th, 1924, to which the Statute of Memel is annexed, viz., Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan of the one part—who had jointly submitted the case to the Court—and Lithuania of the other part, the latter Power being the respondent.

The origin of this dispute lay in the dismissal, on February 6th, 1932, by the Lithuanian Governor of the autonomous Territory, of M. Boettcher, President of the Directorate of Memel. This event had led to others: the dismissal of the other Members of the Directorate; the appointment of a new Directorate, not possessing a parliamentary basis; and, lastly, the dissolution of the Chamber of Representatives of the Territory by the Governor, in agreement with the new Directorate.

The attitude adopted by the Lithuanian Government and the Governor of Memel in this affair had led, first, to proceedings before the Council of the League of Nations—before whom the matter was laid by Germany—and next to negotiations between the signatories of the Convention of 1924, the Four Powers disputing the regularity of Lithuania's acts and their compatibility with the Statute of Memel. It was the difference of opinion which had thus become manifest that the Four Powers finally submitted to the Court.

XII.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

October 17th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

November 3rd.—Permanent Mandates Commission, Geneva.

November 14th or 21st.—Extraordinary Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva.

The operative part of the Court's decision, adopted by ten votes against five, is to the following effect:

(1) That the Governor of the Memel Territory is entitled, as a means of protecting the interests of the State, to dismiss the President of the Directorate of the Territory in case of serious acts by him which violate the Convention of Paris of May 8th, 1924, including its annexes, and are calculated to prejudice the sovereignty of Lithuania, and if no other action can be taken.

(2) That the dismissal of the President of the Directorate does not by itself involve the termination of the appointment of the other members of the Directorate.

(3) That the dismissal of M. Boettcher, carried out on February 6th, 1932, was in order in the circumstances in which it took place.

(4) To reject the objection of the Lithuanian Government to the admissibility of the points relating to the question whether the appointment of the Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis and the dissolution of the Chamber on March 22nd, 1932, were in order.

(5) That, in the circumstances in which it took place, the appointment of the Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis was in order.

(6) That the dissolution of the Chamber of Representatives of the Memel Territory, which was carried out by the Governor of the said Territory when the Directorate presided over by M. Simaitis had not received the confidence of the Chamber, was not in order.

MM. de Bustamante, Altamira, Schücking, and van Eysinga, not agreeing with paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the operative clause, appended to the judgment a dissenting opinion on the first of the said paragraphs, while M. Anzilotti added an individual opinion, to the effect that the Court should have rejected the Application of the Four Powers, as not being in order; M. Urrutia confined himself to expressing his disagreement with paragraphs 1 and 3 of the operative clause.

In the statement of the grounds, the following points may be noted:

* This chapter has been compiled on the basis of material furnished by the Registry of the Court.

(a) *As to Clause No. 1 of the Operative Part of the judgment :*

The Court notes that, by the Convention of May, 1924, the sovereign rights which Germany had ceded to the Allied Powers by the Treaty of Versailles were transferred to Lithuania. Accordingly, Lithuania was to enjoy full sovereignty at Memel, subject only to the autonomy of Memel: this autonomy has, however, only to operate within the limits laid down by the Statute, the silence of which cannot be interpreted as restricting the sovereignty in favour of the autonomy. As regards the autonomous legislative power of the Territory, it is expressly laid down that it only exists within the limits of the Statute. The Governor controls the application of this provision, and is armed for this purpose with a right of veto. No similar rule is provided as regards the autonomous executive power, but the Court is convinced that this power should also be considered as restricted to matters within the competence of the Memel authorities. Accordingly, the Court considers that the Governor must be regarded as possessing the right, under the terms of the Statute, of watching the acts of the autonomous executive power at Memel to satisfy himself that these acts do not exceed the limits of the competence of the local authorities. The means of enforcing this right consist in the right of dismissing the President of the Directorate in cases of gravity. This step constitutes—subject to the conditions set forth in the operative clause—a legitimate and appropriate means of protection of the interests of the State.

The Court holds that this conclusion is not controverted by the provision in the Statute to the effect that "The President . . . shall hold office so long as he possesses the confidence of the Chamber," since this provision does not contemplate the case of the autonomous executive authority violating the Statute by performing acts outside its competence.

(b) *As to Clause No. 2 of the Operative Part :*

The Court holds first that, in view of the broad field covered by the autonomy conferred on Memel by the Statute, the Territory cannot be left without a Government; and secondly that, as regards the Governor, the dismissal of the President of the Directorate is an act limited to the person of the latter. It follows not only that the dismissal of the President does not *ipso facto* involve the termination of the appointments of the other Members, but that the latter must retain their offices until the appointment of a new President, who will be free to replace them by persons of his own choosing, in order to secure the harmonious functioning of the Directorate.

(c) *As to Clause No. 3 of the Operative Part :*

The reason for M. Boettcher's dismissal was a journey he had undertaken to Berlin, where he had conversations with two Ministries. The question which the Court has to settle is whether this journey, in the circumstances in which it took place, fulfills the conditions of gravity mentioned in the first paragraph of the operative clause.

The only agreed facts are those which constitute the external history of the journey. The statements made on either side differ in particular as regards the object of the journey.

The Court considers, however, that it is established that M. Boettcher sought to secure from the German Government better conditions in certain respects for the Memel Territory than those enjoyed by Lithuania as a whole. It considers, further, that M. Boettcher's negotiations fall within the sphere of the conduct of foreign affairs, a sphere which is exclusively reserved to Lithuania under the Statute; and that, in consequence, M. Boettcher's journey constituted a violation of the Statute. Finally, the Court states that the gravity of the incident must be appraised not only by the contents of the agreement which it was sought to conclude, but also, and above all, with regard to the possible repercussions of this arrangement. And, in the view of the Court, these possible repercussions were such as to render M. Boettcher's journey an act against which Lithuania was entitled to protect herself.

(d) *As to Clause No. 4 of the Operative Part :*

By a judgment of June 24th, 1932, the Court overruled a preliminary objection raised by Lithuania in respect of certain points in the Application, and retained these points for decision on their merits. Nevertheless, in her arguments on the merits of these points, Lithuania contended that the difference of views related solely to the political expediency of certain of the Governor's decisions and not to a question of law or fact, and raised in respect of these same points a fresh objection which is described by the Court as a plea to jurisdiction. The Court, however, holds that the difference of opinion certainly relates to points of law or fact concerning the Convention of May 8th, 1924.

(e) *As to Clause No. 5 of the Operative Part :*

The Court observes that, according to the terms of the Statute, the appointment of the Directorate involves two stages: the appointment of the President by the Governor, and the appointment of the other Members by the President. Since Lithuania is responsible only for acts of the Governor, and not for those of the President, the Court is only concerned with the first stage.

As to the appointment of the President, the Court holds that, under the Statute, the Governor is bound by one condition only: the President must be a citizen of the Memel Territory. In the view of the Court, the Governor is, in particular, not bound to make sure in advance that the Chamber will approve his choice; the Chamber will give or withhold its confidence when, in due time, the Directorate appears before it. Be that as it may, the Governor might reasonably have believed that the Chamber would pass a vote of confidence in M. Simaitis. The appointment of the latter did not, therefore, involve any action contrary to the Statute.

(f) *As to Clause No. 6 of the Operative Part:*

The Court observes, first, that, under the Statute, the Governor cannot dissolve the Chamber on his own authority, but requires the concurrence of the Directorate, and that the purpose of this provision is to ensure that the local elements shall have some voice in deciding whether or not the Chamber should be dissolved.

The Court therefore holds that it is necessary to distinguish between the powers of a Directorate which has, and those of a Directorate which has not received the confidence of the Chamber; according to the Court, this confidence may be expressed not only by a formal vote but also by effective co-operation over a period of time. The Court, in fact, considers that where a Directorate, which has functioned as such with the consent of the Chamber, agrees to a dissolution, such agreement shows the approval of an element which may be taken to represent local views and tendencies; but that if, on the other hand, the prior confidence and co-operation of the Chamber are lacking, the reverse is the case.

When the Simaitis Directorate gave the Governor its consent to dissolve the Chamber on March 22nd, it had never functioned as a Directorate with the consent of the Chamber; the dissolution occurred when the Directorate was making its first appearance before the Chamber.

3. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF SOUTH-EASTERN GREENLAND.

By an Order delivered on August 2nd, 1932, the Court—

(1) Joined the two suits concerning the legal status of certain parts of South-Eastern Greenland brought on July 18th, 1932, by the Norwegian Government and by the Danish Government respectively;

(2) Fixed as follows the time-limits for the written proceedings in the case before it:

For the filing of a Case by each of the Parties, February 1st, 1933;

For the filing of a Counter-Case by each of the Parties, March 15th, 1933;

(3) Declared that it would, if necessary, subsequently fix the time-limits for the submission of Replies and Rejoinders, if any.

On August 3rd, 1932, the Court gave its decision in the form of an Order on the request for the indication of interim measures of protection made by the Norwegian Government.*

By its Order the Court dismisses the request of the Norwegian Government for the indication of interim measures of protection; nevertheless it reserves its right subsequently to consider whether circumstances have arisen requiring the indication of such measures in accordance with Article 41 of the Statute.

The facts of the case and the reasons on which the Court's Order is based may be summarised as follows:

By a decree dated July 12th, 1932, the Norwegian Government declared that it had occupied a part of the south-east coast of Greenland, about 400 kilometres in extent. In this territory are a number of Norwegian hunters, one of whom had been invested with police powers over foreigners as well as Norwegians. Two Danish expeditions are on their way to the same region or have already arrived there; some members of these expeditions have also been invested with police powers.

On the basis of statements made by certain Danish individuals and reproduced in the Danish Press, the Norwegian Government considered that there was serious reason to fear that regrettable incidents might occur. Accordingly it requested the Court, as an "interim measure of protection," to "order" the Danish Government to "abstain in the said territory from any coercive measure directed against Norwegian nationals." The Danish Government, for its part, asked the Court to dismiss the Norwegian request as groundless. In its contention there was no reason to fear such incidents, and the Danish Government was in no way responsible for the statements in the Press adduced by the Norwegian Government. The Danish Government also argued that the provisions relating to measures of protection were solely intended for the protection of rights and not for the prevention of incidents.

In its Order, the Court first of all observes that it has power to indicate measures of protection both at the request of the parties and *proprio motu*; accordingly, it considers first whether it should comply with the request of the Norwegian Government, and then whether it should indicate measures of protection *proprio motu*.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 239.

With regard to the Norwegian request, the Court begins by observing that in this case there is no occasion for it to take a final stand as regards the question whether its Statute provides for interim measures of protection solely for the purpose of protecting a right, or whether it also permits such measures for the prevention of incidents; for, from either point of view, the Court arrives at the same result.

Adopting the first point of view, the Court observes, in this connection, that the Norwegian request is not based on the plea that the action which the Norwegian Government asks the Court to prevent would prejudice some recognised or alleged Norwegian right; moreover, the incidents feared by Norway cannot in any way affect the only rights which might enter into account, namely, the sovereign rights claimed by Norway, were the Court subsequently to recognise these rights.

Adopting the second of the points of view mentioned above, the Court observes that the parties have made declarations before it, which, in the view of the Court, even granting that they were, to a certain extent, conditional or subject to reservations, are eminently reassuring. In this connection the Court emphasises the fact that, once these statements have been made before it, it cannot presume that the parties might act otherwise than in conformity with the intentions thus expressed. In regard to this point, the Court also observes, in the first place, that the object of the Convention of 1924 concerning Eastern Greenland—a Convention which is in force between the parties—is precisely to prevent a dispute from arising, and, secondly, that—once the dispute concerning rights of sovereignty has been submitted to it—no act of the respective Governments in the disputed territory could have any effect whatever on the legal situation which the Court is called upon to define, and that accordingly the parties have no interest in provoking incidents.

Passing on to the question of the possible indication, *proprio motu*, of interim measures of protection, the Court states that it must consider this question simply and solely in relation to the dispute concerning South-East Greenland, which arose in 1932; it further declares that in regard to that dispute there could be no question of safeguarding other rights than the rights of sovereignty, if any, of the respective countries. Both parties have declared before the Court that, pending the Court's decision on the merits of the dispute, they intend to refrain from any action calculated to modify the legal status of the territory in dispute. The Court is moreover of opinion, according to the information at present at its disposal, that, having regard to the natural

characteristics of the territory, even measures of this kind could not affect the value of any rights which the Court may, in the future, recognise as appertaining to one or other of the parties to the dispute.

Finally, the Court points out that both parties, being bound by the General Act of 1928, have undertaken to abstain from any sort of action whatever which may aggravate or extend a dispute, and that this undertaking is placed under the guarantee of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court itself.

It is in view of the considerations summarised above that the Court reaches the conclusion that the circumstances of the case, including the safeguarding of any rights that may be in question, do not at present require that the Court should indicate any provisional measures of protection either in compliance with the Norwegian request to that effect, or *proprio motu*.

4. INTERPRETATION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1919 ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN DURING THE NIGHT.

Within the period (expiring on August 1st) fixed for this purpose, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the International Labour Office, and the International Federation of Trades Unions filed their respective memorials. On August 12th a Memorial was also filed by the International Confederation of Christian Trades Unions. The President of the Court decided that the latter memorial should be accepted, though it was filed after the expiry of the period mentioned above.

On August 4th the Court decided to allow second written memorials to be filed within a period expiring on September 12th, 1932.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has appointed as its Agent Sir Bertram Okeden Bircham, M.C., Solicitor to the Ministry of Labour, and as its assistant Agent Mr. Ernest Hamilton Richards, Solicitor, Chief Clerk Solicitor's Department, Ministry of Labour.

5. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRINCE OF PLESS.

On July 25th, 1932, the Court decided to request the applicant party (Germany), in accordance with Art. 40, para. 1, No. 4, of the Rules of Court, to deposit a volume required to complete the documents in the case by August 8th, 1932, at latest. This period was subsequently extended to August 31st, 1932. The volume in question was duly deposited by the Agent of the German Government on the above-mentioned date.

The Polish Government has appointed M. Thadeus Sobolewski, Doctor of Laws, and Principal Councillor of the State Litigation Office, as its Agent in the case.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly):

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly)

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 5s. \$1.25

4. *LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual)

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (*Trilingual*) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

9. *I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual):

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS:

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

*Studies on Industrial Relations. I. xii + 263 pp.	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. II. v + 162 pp.	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	3s. 6d.	\$1.00
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	5s. 0d.	\$2.00
*Wages and Conditions of Labour in the U.S.S.R., by S. Zagorsky. v + 212 pp.		4s. 0d.	\$1.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930. iv + 692 pp.		16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building. xii + 378 pp.		5s. 0d.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation. vii + 381 pp.		8s. 0d.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene. vii + 188 pp.		6s. 0d.	\$1.50
*Women's Work under Labour Laws iv + 264 pp.	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	7s. 6d.	\$2.00

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopædia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)

	{ <i>Paper bound</i>	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
Volume edition (in two volumes)	{ <i>Cloth bound</i>	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
		£3 10s. 0d.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. M. R. K. BURGE,
12, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.1.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
Sowest, London.)
Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)

U.S.A.

American Sales Agents:
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, Mount Vernon Street,
Boston 9, Mass.

JAPAN

Mr. J. ASARI,
Shisei Kalkan Bldg., Hibiya
Park, Kojimachiku,
Tokio. (Telegrams:
Kokusairodo, Tokio.)
Telephone: Ginza 1580.)

INDIA

Mr. P. P. PILLAI,
International Labour Office
(Indian Branch)
New Delhi.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
New Delhi.)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

JUST OUT.

WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY, 1931-32.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932. II. A. 18.)

328 pages. Price : In wrappers, 6/- \$1.50. Bound in cloth, 7/6. \$2.50.

The Survey contains a brief summary of the economic developments of the first decade after the war, in order to provide a background for an understanding of the crisis which developed in 1929.

The second chapter gives a brief description of the course of the depression. This narrative and the detailed chapters which follow are brought as close up to date as possible, information being given in many instances up to the middle of 1932. After the narrative of events, different aspects of economic life in the depression are examined in successive chapters. Starting with the production of commodities, the Survey proceeds to discuss the fall in prices, the shrinkage of international trade, difficulties in balancing international accounts, changes in banking structure and policy, wages and unemployment, public finance and commercial policy. A final chapter surveys the economic situation in July 1932 and various proposals made for its alleviation.

REVIEW OF WORLD PRODUCTION, 1925-1931.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. II. A. 13.)

166 pages Price : 5/- \$1.25.

This volume is a continuation of the *Memorandum on Production and Trade* which was published year by year from 1926 to 1931. It covers the years 1925 to 1931 inclusive ; attention is mainly focussed on the changes which have occurred since the beginning of the economic depression, and so far as possible the discussion has been brought up to the first months of 1932.

The chapter on PRIMARY PRODUCTION shows the changes in the world output of crude foodstuffs and industrial raw materials and in the continental distribution of production during the past six years. Special emphasis is laid on the development of production, both in general and of particular commodity groups, during the present economic depression and the correlative movements of international trade are also shown in some detail.

The chapter on INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION analyses the changes which have taken place in the industrial activity of 20 principal countries and gives a weighted international average of certain national indices. The variations in the output of particular lines of industry, and the relative changes in the production of producers' and consumers' goods are shown.

Finally, a chapter of PRICE MOVEMENTS analyses the movements in the general level of prices both before and during the crisis ; in the latter period, attention is particularly directed to the differences in the price movements of countries which have remained on the gold standard, those which abandoned gold payments, and those which have instituted foreign exchange control. The price movements of some 40 individual commodities on world markets are shown, and the differences in the price behaviour of significant commodity groups, such as raw materials and manufactured goods, cartellised and non-cartellised products, etc., are discussed.

The volume is completed by a number of *tabular appendices*, containing detailed data on the subjects discussed in the body of the Review.

PUBLISHED PREVIOUSLY.

THE COURSE AND PHASES OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC DEPRESSION.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1931. V. A. 21.)

340 pages Price : 6/- \$1.50.

Complete catalogue sent free on application.

PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT, LEAGUE OF NATIONS, GENEVA.

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 10.

OCTOBER, 1932.

Thirteenth Ordinary
Session of the Assembly.

Admission of Iraq to the
League.

<i>Annual Subscription</i>	8/-.
<i>Single Copies</i>	- 1/-.
<i>Double Number</i>	- 2/-.

<i>Annual Subscription</i>	\$2.
<i>Single Copies</i>	- - 20c.
<i>Double Number</i>	- - 40c.

Agents for the United States:
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies:
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada:
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 10.

OCTOBER, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, October, 1932</i>	272	2. <i>International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character</i>	290
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments</i>	273	VII. <i>Organisation of Peace :</i>	
III. <i>Commission of Inquiry for European Union</i>	274	1. <i>The Press and the Organisation of Peace</i>	290
IV. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions :</i>		2. <i>Collaboration of Women in the Organisation of Peace</i>	290
1. <i>Admission of Iraq to the League</i>	276	VIII. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>	
2. <i>Elections to the Council</i>	279	1. <i>Mandates</i>	291
3. <i>Amendment of Rules 4 and 17 of the Assembly Rules of Procedure</i>	279	<i>Frontier between Iraq and Syria</i>	291
4. <i>Protocol Concerning Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court</i>	279	2. <i>Danzig : Appointment of a High Commissioner</i>	291
5. <i>Nationality of Women</i>	280	IX. <i>Protection of Minorities :</i>	
6. <i>International Engagements : Registration of Treaties</i>	280	1. <i>Work of the Assembly</i>	291
V. <i>Technical Organisations :</i>		2. <i>Work of the Council</i>	292
1. <i>Health Organisation :</i>		X. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
(a) <i>Work of the Health Committee</i>	281	1. <i>Appeal of the Chinese Government</i>	294
(b) <i>Work of the Assembly</i>	285	2. <i>Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay</i>	295
2. <i>Economic and Financial Organisation :</i>		3. <i>Request for Assistance from Liberia : Dr. MacKenzie's Mission to the Kru Coast</i>	296
(a) <i>Work of the Economic and Financial Organisation</i>	285	XI. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions :</i>	
(b) <i>Memorandum from the League Loans Committee</i>	288	1. <i>Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People</i>	297
(c) <i>Relations between the League and the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome</i>	288	2. <i>Penal and Penitentiary Questions</i>	298
3. <i>Communications and Transit</i>	289	3. <i>Traffic in Opium :</i>	
VI. <i>Intellectual Co-operation :</i>		(a) <i>Meeting of the Permanent Central Opium Board</i>	298
1. <i>Work of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation</i>	289	(b) <i>Drafting of a Model Administrative Code</i>	299
		4. <i>Slavery</i>	299

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

	PAGE
5. Assistance to Refugees . . .	300
6. International Relief Union :	
Entry into Force of the Convention . . .	301
XII. <i>Budgetary and Internal Organisation Questions :</i>	
(a) The League's Budget . . .	301
(b) Contributions in Arrear . . .	302
(c) Allocation of Expenses . . .	302
(d) Rationalisation of the Various Organs of the League . . .	302
(e) Higher Officials . . .	302
(f) Appointment of the Secretary-General . . .	303
(g) Salaries of Officials . . .	303
(h) Elections to the Supervisory Commission . . .	303
(i) Administrative Tribunal . . .	303
(j) Resignation of M. Suvich . . .	303
XIII. <i>Annotated Bibliography of the Principal Volumes on the League</i>	304
XIV. <i>Forthcoming Events</i> . . .	305

	PAGE
<i>The Permanent Court of International Justice.</i>	
1. Twenty-sixth Session of the Court . . .	303
2. Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 concerning the Employment of Women during the Night . . .	306
3. The Prince of Pless Administration . . .	306
4. Cases concerning certain Judgments delivered by the Hungary-Czechoslovak Mixed Arbitral Tribunal . . .	307
5. The Eastern Greenland Case . . .	307
6. The Optional Clause . . .	307
7. Protocol of September 14th, 1929, relating to the Accession of the United States of America . . .	307
8. Communication of Treaties . . .	307
ANNEX.	
Resolutions of the Assembly . . .	308
SUPPLEMENT.	
Summary of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Sino-Japanese Dispute.	

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

October, 1932.

The Thirteenth Ordinary Assembly and the Council pursued their work during October. The Bureau of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the Commission of Inquiry for European Union, the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Health Committee also met in the course of the month.

The Assembly held in all twelve plenary meetings and ended its work on October 17th. The admission of Iraq to the League, the first country under mandate to be promoted to full independence, was its outstanding decision.

The other principal events of the month were the publication of the Lytton Commission Report and the appointment by the Council, subject to the Assembly's approval, of M. Joseph Avenol to succeed Sir Eric Drummond as Secretary-General of the League.

The general discussion on the work of the League, which included the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay, was shorter than in preceding years. The explanation is that the grave problems at issue were being, or are to be dealt with by other bodies: disarmament by the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the Far Eastern dispute by

the Council and the Special Assembly, the economic and financial crisis by the World Monetary and Economic Conference.

The Assembly attended to different legal and constitutional, economic and financial, social and humanitarian questions as well as to problems bearing on intellectual co-operation, communications and transit, mandates, the protection of minorities, etc. It elected three non-permanent members of the Council, decided in principle to set up an advisory committee of experts on slavery, and adopted certain measures to provide for the reorganisation of the Secretariat.

In his closing speech, M. Politis, the President of the Assembly, pointed out that despite all difficulties the work of the League was proceeding regularly; in every sphere with which it was concerned its efforts were being pursued with unshaken continuity; while by the admission of three new Members during the past year, and by the extension of its activities to every Continent, it was steadily making good its claim to universality. "When we consider these things," he added, "we cannot deny its vitality or entertain serious doubts of its future!"

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.*

The Bureau of the Conference had, on September 26th, decided to consider at a meeting to be held during the week beginning on October 10th the question of convening the General Commission.†

The Bureau met on October 13th.

The President, Mr. Henderson, informed the members of the dealings which he had had with the German Government on the question of equality of rights. Certain conversations were taking place which would, he hoped, pave the way for the Conference's further work. He had, when in Paris, seen the French Premier, M. Herriot, who had informed him that a French plan regarding security and disarmament was being prepared and would shortly be submitted to the Conference. Mr. Henderson added that, in his opinion, the Conference should consider the two questions simultaneously.

Since it was essential that definite progress be made before the end of the year, in order that a drafting committee might begin to put the decisions taken into the form of convention articles, the President asked for authorisation: (1) to convene the Bureau for Thursday, November 3rd; (2) to give the one month's notice required by the resolution of July 23rd for the convening of the General Commission, so that this might meet in the week beginning November 21st.

The members of the Bureau supported the President's proposals. It was agreed that the Bureau should, at its meeting of November 3rd, note M. Bourquin's report on the question of supervision, M. Pilotti's on the prohibition of chemical warfare, M. Buero's on the limits to be fixed for the calibre of heavy artillery and the maximum tonnage for tanks, and M. de Madariaga's on the procedure to be followed when further considering the problem of air forces.‡

On October 15th Mr. Henderson sent to all the States taking part in the Conference a circular letter giving the one month's notice required for convening the General Commission during the week beginning November 21st.

* * *

The Technical Committee of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure finished its examination of the documentation submitted

* Point (c) 2. in the article on the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, published in the preceding number of the Monthly Summary (page 247), should read: *Limits to be fixed for National Defence Expenditure.*

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 247.

by the United States, the Irish Free State, the Netherlands, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and Yugoslavia. It is still considering that supplied by the following countries: South Africa, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Finland, New Zealand.

It further began its consideration of the special questions referred to it by the Commission on National Defence Expenditure and dealt first with the question of fluctuations in the purchasing power of currency in so far as these affect the limitation of national defence expenditure. The Technical Committee also began to prepare its report, which it hopes to finish before the end of the year.

* * *

The Special Committee on Effectives‡ met from September 30th to October 14th. It elected M. de Brouckère (Belgium) as Chairman and M. Westman (Sweden) as Vice-Chairman.

The Committee first adopted a plan of work submitted by the United States delegate and based on President Hoover's proposal. All the delegations—except that of the U.S.S.R. which, however, stated that it was in favour of the ideas underlying the Hoover proposal—accepted the principle of the division of effectives into two categories, an irreducible and a reducible.

After consideration of the matter by a Subcommittee the Committee adopted as a basis for calculating the irreducible component in the case of home forces the following text:

The Committee is of the opinion that, in order to obtain the basis of calculation, in accordance with the régime prescribed for the Powers whose forces are limited by the treaties of peace, for the strength of the irreducible component for home territories, it is necessary in order to obtain a first approximation, to base it upon the figures of population. For this calculation the rates may vary in an inverse ratio to the population.

The index figures thus obtained in terms of professional soldiers will be transformed in accordance with rules to be subsequently determined in order to take into account the character of forces of each country.

Corrections will subsequently be made, if necessary, empirically, in consideration of the special conditions of States in various regional groups; by taking into account the following factors:—

- (a) Area.
- (b) Length and nature of frontiers.
- (c) Situation of vital centres in relation to frontiers.§

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 247.

§ The Soviet delegation declared that it could not support this text and the United Kingdom delegation expressed certain misgivings as to paragraph 2.

The question of overseas effectives was referred for consideration to a Sub-Committee consisting of the delegations of Powers possessing colonies.

The Committee further decided that naval and air effectives could provisionally be left aside in the calculation of the effectives covered by the Hoover proposal; it merely requested a committee of experts to define the naval effectives destined for use in connection with land operations or coastal defence.

The Committee lastly requested its Technical Committee of Experts to consider the characteristics of the various police forces and similar formations belonging to States represented on the Committee on Effectives with a view to determining later which police forces of the various States should be taken into account when calculating effectives.

* * *

The Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Munitions of War elected M. de Scavenius (Denmark) to the Chair and M.

Komarnicki (Poland) as rapporteur. It met from the 4th to the 19th October.

The Committee reviewed all the questions raised in the matter of the trade in and manufacture of arms without as yet being in a position to submit concrete proposals. The Committee agreed that such proposals—one of the aims of which would be to treat manufacturing and non-manufacturing States on the same footing—should depart from the 1929 Convention and would involve revision of the 1925 Convention on the Traffic in Arms.

The Committee set up two Sub-Committees, the first on the *Manufacture of Arms*, consisting of the representatives of Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Japan, Poland, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States; the second, for the *Trade in Arms*, composed of representatives of China, France, Italy, Japan, Persia, Poland, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The Committee further decided to circulate to the Governments represented at the Conference a questionnaire regarding the manufacture of arms.

III.—COMMISSION OF INQUIRY FOR EUROPEAN UNION.

The Commission of Inquiry for European Union held its sixth session on September 30th and October 1st. It elected M. Herriot (France) to the Chair.

In his statement on the work of the Stresa Conference, M. Georges Bonnet (France), President of the Conference—first recalled that the Lausanne Conference had instructed a special Committee to submit to the Commission of Inquiry for European Union proposals for restoring normal conditions in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe; these covered in particular: (a) measures to overcome the present transfer difficulties of these countries and to render possible the progressive abolition of the present system of exchange restrictions, subject to the necessary safeguards; (b) measures to revive the activity of trade both among those countries with other States and to overcome the difficulties caused to the agricultural countries of Central and Eastern Europe by the fall in the price of cereals, the rights of third countries being reserved.

The following States were represented at this meeting, held at Stresa from September 5th to 20th: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Roumania, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia.*

* A representative of Latvia was present as an observer. The Secretariat of the League of Nations, the International Labour Office and the Rome Institute of Agriculture were also represented.

The Stresa Conference, after setting up two Committees—the one Financial, the other Economic and Agricultural—adopted a certain number of recommendations and resolutions. In the economic field it condemned all obstacles to free exchange, stating that not only the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, but all European States should gradually return to a system of liberty, with the adjustments which would no doubt be necessary. Since it felt that one of the essential causes of the crisis in Central and Eastern Europe was the disastrous drop in the prices of agricultural products—in particular those of cereals—the Conference drew up a draft Convention—to be valid until 1935—for the revalorisation of cereals. This draft made provision for advantages to be granted on the basis of the average quantities of cereals exported by each country during the last three years, each country granting either a sort of premium by paying a financial contribution or, by means of treaties, providing special advantages in respect of cereals. The fund to be devoted to the revalorisation of cereals was to amount to 75,000,000 Swiss francs, to be maintained by contributions from States, arranging payment either by means of bilateral treaties or by a special contribution. A Committee composed of one delegate of each beneficiary country, one delegate of each cereal-producing country, and two representatives of non-importing European countries was to determine the share

of the aggregate sum to be allotted to each of the beneficiary States.

The Conference further set forth certain principles regarding the settlement of short and long term debts and recommended the constitution of a fund to be used, at the appropriate moment, to regularise monetary conditions in Central and Eastern Europe.

The Conference, said M. Bonnet, had expressly left it to the Commission of Inquiry to determine the details of the working of the proposed organisation, in particular on the following points: (1) How was the contribution of each State to be fixed*? (2) Who would administer the common funds? (3) Would the funds be divided into two parts, the first for agricultural, the second for monetary purposes, or would there be a single fund?

On October 1st the Commission discussed a draft resolution in which States Members of the Commission of Inquiry stated that in their view the reports, conclusions and drafts of the Stresa Conference contained the essential elements of a policy designed to restore the European economic and financial situation, and, in particular, that of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. They declared that each was, for its own part, and subject only to the particular observations it might have to make, ready to apply as far as might be possible and without delay the general guiding principles resulting from these reports, conclusions and drafts, which they decided to bring to the notice of the Council of the League, the Preparatory Committee of Experts for the Monetary and Economic Conference and the Conference itself.

At the same time the draft resolution requested the Council to arrange, with the help of the competent organs of the League and other qualified experts, for a detailed and thorough examination and elaboration of the draft monetary normalisation fund. These experts were further to examine whether and in what conditions the fund for the revalorisation of cereals might be combined with the monetary normalisation fund. The draft to be drawn up was to be communicated to the Governments concerned by November 15th at latest and should be submitted to the Commission of Inquiry during a session to be held in December.

The draft resolution requested M. Georges Bonnet to take the necessary steps to ensure liaison between the Commission of Inquiry

* M. Bonnet pointed out that it had seemed the general opinion that the working fund should be deposited with the Bank for International Settlements.

for European Union and the Normalisation Fund Committee.

The Council was also asked to undertake, in co-operation with the competent organs of the League and other qualified experts, the practical examination of the tobacco problem, which concerned three Eastern European States (Greece, Turkey, and Bulgaria). The States favourable to the conclusion of bilateral agreements conforming to the principles established at Stresa declared that they were henceforth each individually ready to seek or to promote the conclusion of such agreements along lines bringing these within the framework of the Convention drawn up at Stresa.

The Commission lastly expressed the hope that decisions might be taken at its December session on the question of the funds for the normalisation of exchanges and for the revalorisation of cereals, thus following up the draft Convention with practical action.

The representatives of the United Kingdom, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Greece, Turkey, Italy, Sweden, Estonia, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Roumania, Hungary, Austria, Denmark, Poland, Finland, Latvia, Bulgaria, and the Irish Free State in turn expressed the views of their Governments on the draft resolution; this showed a general approved subject in certain cases, however, to reservations.

In conclusion, the Chairman, M. Herriot, noted that the following conclusions might be drawn from the discussion which had taken place:

1. In all circumstances the rights of third States were reserved.
2. Governments would only have to give a final decision on the definite drafts after these had been submitted to them for approval.
3. All the reservations put forward during the present meeting would be set out in the Minutes.

Subject to these reservations, the Commission adopted the draft resolution.

Before declaring the session closed, the President stated that the Commission would begin work again during the meeting of the Special Assembly, probably at the beginning of December.

The Council considered the Commission's resolution of October 1st at its meetings of October 13th and 15th.

On the report of the French representative, M. Bérenger, it noted the Commission of Inquiry's resolution, authorised its President, after consultation with its rapporteur on financial and economic questions and with the

Chairman of the Financial and Economic Committees, to proceed to the appointment of a Committee of qualified experts to undertake the detailed and thorough examination and preparation of the monetary normalisation fund scheme.

The scheme drawn up by the experts was to be submitted to the Governments and forwarded to the Preparatory Committee for the Monetary and Economic Conference in good time before the close of its work.

The Council lastly requested the Bureau of the Economic Committee to submit to it at its next meeting proposals as to the composition of a Committee to undertake the practical examination of the tobacco problem. The United Kingdom representative, Mr. Eden, recalled that certain reservations had been made on behalf of his Government regarding participation in the funds proposed by the Stresa Conference. These reservations still held good; none the less, in view of the importance of the proposals made, the United Kingdom could support the draft resolution. No doubt the proposed committee would, during its work, be entitled to discuss the general conditions of monetary normalisation in the countries concerned, and would be at liberty to propose any measures which it might consider advisable to meet the situation.

The rapporteur replied that he had no objection to the United Kingdom's reservations and the draft resolution was, in these conditions, adopted.

On October 15th the President of the Council, in conformity with this resolution, appointed the following members of the Committee of Experts to undertake the detailed examination and preparation of the monetary normalisation fund scheme:

M. Bachmann (Switzerland), President of the Swiss National Bank.

Professor Bruins (Netherlands), Royal Commissioner of the Bank of the Netherlands.

M. G. Dayras (France), Inspector of Finances, Member of the Financial Committee.

Dr. F. Mlynarski (Poland), Professor of the School of Higher Commercial Studies at Warsaw, formerly Deputy-Governor of the Bank of Poland, Member of the Financial Committee.

M. Momchiloff (Bulgaria), Governor of the National Bank of Bulgaria.

Geheimrat Dr. Müller (Germany), *Reichsbankdirektorium*.

N. Di Nola (Italy), Director-General of the Istituto Italiano di Credito Fondiario, Member of the Economic Committee.

M. Protitch (Yugoslavia), Director of the National Bank of Yugoslavia.

M. Paul van Zeeland (Belgium), Director of the National Bank of Belgium.

The Sixth Committee of the Assembly and the Assembly itself dealt with the work of the Commission of Inquiry for European Union.† The rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, M. Motta, proposed to the Assembly that the Commission should be invited to continue the work undertaken, in accordance with the principles laid down in the resolution of September 17th, 1930, and to submit a report on its subsequent work at the next ordinary session of the Assembly.

The work accomplished during the first part of 1932 had not amounted to very much, since circumstances had prevented the discussion and execution of certain tasks which the Commission had proposed to carry out. It had, however, a few days earlier, considered the results of the Stresa Conference and adopted a resolution on this subject. M. Motta added that he hoped that next year, after the meeting of the world Monetary and Economic Conference, the Commission's task would assume great importance. The Commission would probably meet during December and would continue to work within the framework of the League. The Assembly adopted the draft resolution submitted.

IV.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

I. ADMISSION OF IRAQ TO THE LEAGUE.

The Assembly, at its meeting of October 3rd, on the proposal of its Sixth Committee, unanimously agreed to Iraq's admission to the League.*

M. Yevtitch (Yugoslavia), rapporteur of the

* See Monthly Summary, 1932, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 256.

Sixth Committee, said that a wise and prudent application of Article 22 of the Covenant had been crowned by the admission of Iraq, now a free and independent State, to membership of the League.

After emphasising the importance of this event, both for Iraq and for the League, he paid

† For Assembly resolution: see Annex, page 308.

a tribute to the Mandatory Power for its co-operation and expressed his sincerest wishes for the prosperity of the young State and the happiness of its people.

M. Lange (Norway), Chairman of the Sixth Committee, emphasising the moral aspect of international interdependence, recalled that Iraq had, by its entry into the League, solemnly recognised its duty to its racial and religious minorities. Those minorities must know, as the Government of Iraq must know, that there were around them in all other countries currents of opinion which would follow with the closest attention the development of the State of Iraq and the fate of the different elements in her population.

After the Credentials Committee had reported, the representatives of the Kingdom of Iraq took their seats in the Assembly.

The President of the Assembly, M. Politis, spoke as follows :

Gentlemen, it is my privilege and special pleasure, on behalf of the Assembly, to congratulate you as delegates of the Kingdom of Iraq and to extend to you a cordial welcome among us.

Let me assure you that we fully understand and share the legitimate joy which you must be feeling at the present moment, for to-day is a great day for your country. Iraq, by a unanimous vote of this Assembly, has just received the well-merited reward of the praiseworthy efforts she has made during the past few years to organise the country, to establish her political status, to delimit her frontiers and to cope with the multiple problems confronting her rulers as the outcome of the needs of national life and the complexities of international relations.

Now, after many centuries of foreign domination, Iraq has at last recovered her liberty, and she may, if she so wishes, revert to the traditions of the fabulous civilisation whose glory and splendour the names of Nineveh and Babylon have perpetuated in the memory of mankind. Henceforward, she will know of other form of submission than that which is known to all of us here : obedience to the rules of international law and respect for the general obligations specifically assumed towards the League of Nations.

We enter the more readily into Iraq's joy in that to-day is not only a great date in Iraq's history, but a great date in the history of the nations and in the development of the League. Her admission assures us the invaluable co-operation of the Arab race. It marks the beginning of the political resurrection of the various peoples belonging to that race, a proud and noble race which, thanks to its qualities of valour, tenacity, and energy has made so deep an impress wherever it has dwelt and wherever it has passed.

Iraq's admission, moreover, marks the steady progress of the League towards a condition of universality corresponding alike to its ideal and to our experience of life. Facts are showing more

clearly every day that the organisation the foundations of which were laid by the Covenant will not yield us all we are entitled to expect of it until all the nations have agreed to participate in its life.

During the past year our membership has been increased by three, and now numbers 56 States. After the entry of Mexico, we had the privilege of welcoming Turkey, and now after Turkey comes Iraq. The successive admission of those last two countries assumes in my eyes the value of a symbol ; for, long subject as they were to a régime of oppression from which they have succeeded in freeing themselves, they stand to-day on a footing of complete equality in the family of nations assembled for the welfare of mankind. Thus the gates of the League stand ever open, ready to welcome all nations. It is our inmost hope that those who are not yet among us may one day take here the place to which they are entitled in our joint work of pacific endeavour. Let them rest assured in advance that they will receive the sincere and cordial welcome so characteristic of League life.

Viewed from yet other aspects, Iraq's admission is a highly significant event. It shows that peoples who are worthy of liberty are not slow to achieve it when they have acquired a realisation of their national qualities, when they can apply those qualities in such a way as to merit the esteem and consideration of the world and when they are fortunate enough to have at their head, for the purpose of making those same qualities manifest, an enlightened guide.

That is why, now that the moment has come to welcome the Kingdom of Iraq here, our thoughts turn in particular to its eminent chief, His Majesty King Feisal, and we extend to him our sincere congratulations on the great work he has successfully accomplished.

The present event shows further that the institution of mandates is not, as its detractors and those of the League may have thought, a hypocritical mask for annexation in disguise, but a necessary apprenticeship through which, before reverting to or achieving liberty, the peoples must necessarily pass who have perhaps lost or are not yet experienced in the use of liberty. When we see, as the example before us shows, that this is indeed the case, we must rejoice at the existence of an institution capable of producing such results, and must congratulate alike the people which has employed it for its own emancipation and the Power which has successfully acquitted itself of its task as educator.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has given the world yet another signal proof of the supreme virtues of liberalism and magnanimity and of its rare administrative and political ability. The civilising mission which that Power is carrying on in the most diverse and remote parts of the globe offers, as it has always offered, a guarantee of order and prosperity and constitutes at the same time a school of energy and liberty.

May I, on behalf of the Assembly, extend to the United Kingdom Government an expression of our gratitude and our admiration ?

I should be falling short of my duty were I to omit, in this expression of our thanks for the work carried out in Iraq, the Permanent Mandates Commission. That body may justly claim its share in the success of the institution over whose sound working it is responsible for watching.

This event is characterised by yet another feature which it is my duty to point out. It bears witness to the League's capacity to achieve pacific successes and to keep abreast of changes which the life of the peoples makes necessary. Thanks to that power, we see in the example of Iraq, with the consent and to the satisfaction of all concerned the birth of a new State which, without the League—the history of the last century enlightens us on this point—would probably never have taken place save by violence. The League thus gives the lie to those who bring against it a charge of perpetuating existing situations and obstructing the normal course of life; for it shows that, by the very action of its rules, it does in fact afford an opportunity of attaining by evolution what otherwise could in most cases only be obtained by revolution.

When, despite the difficulties and pre-occupations of the present hour, we see the League capable of ensuring even in this direction, the regular working of its machinery we feel persuaded that the crisis through which it is said to be passing is only apparent and that its vital functioning is unimpaired. In that the Kingdom of Iraq has given us an opportunity of demonstrating and rejoicing in the League's vitality, that country is entitled to our reiterated congratulations and cordial welcome, to which we would add, in all sincerity, our very grateful thanks.

The Prime Minister of Iraq, M. Noury Pacha el Said, said in reply:

I should like first of all, if I may, to thank you all most sincerely on behalf of my Government for the decision which you have just taken and by which you have admitted our country to membership of the League of Nations.

Iraq appreciates very greatly the high honour of being received into this society of free nations, and we are deeply touched by the cordial and encouraging words which the President of this Assembly has just addressed to us as representatives of our August Sovereign and of our country. We can assure you that these words will be very much appreciated by our people who have impatiently awaited the realisation of their hopes.

The régime provided for in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations was provisional, and the Iraq people have never ceased to aspire eagerly to their complete and lasting independence. By the decision which you have taken to-day, you have not only performed the great duty which was incumbent upon you, but you have also rendered justice to a nation which, although still young, is the proud possessor of a great past of several civilisations. It is also our duty, on this historic occasion, to express our gratitude to Great Britain for the admirable and timely manner in which she has performed her task, not merely in the letter but in the spirit of the Covenant of the League.

In all the vicissitudes of my country's existence, there has always been one man especially who has never lost confidence in international justice and the future of his people. I refer to His Majesty King Feisal, and I am sure you will agree that the homage which has been rendered to him in this great Assembly is the homage which he deserves.

At the end of a relatively short period of time, Iraq can claim to be a united country with a constitutional régime which has proved itself worthy of co-operating with you in the fulfilment of your great ideals in the service of the peace of the world.

As member of the Assembly, where all nations—whether great or small—are equal, we acknowledge the great responsibility which devolves upon us, and we can assure you that we shall spare no effort to perform our task loyally and honourably.

Situated, as she is, at the cross roads of the great trade routes, Iraq declares that she is fully sensible of the important rôle which she is now called upon to play. Her sole ambition will be to continue her progress, to maintain and work unceasingly for the establishment of the most friendly relations with her neighbours, and to co-operate loyally to the utmost of her ability in the work of this great Assembly in the cause of universal peace and general prosperity.

At this moment of national rejoicing, you will allow us to express the hope that, within a short time, we may be able to welcome to membership of this great League our brothers whose destiny has not yet been decided. It is by governing that one learns to be a good governor. The example given by the greatest Empire deserves to be studied and followed. In expressing our sincere and abiding gratitude to the British people we know that we are interpreting the sentiments of all our people.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), speaking as the representative of the Mandatory Power, welcomed Iraq's entry into the League:

My colleagues in the Assembly will permit a few words at this interesting and historic moment from the representative of the country whose privilege it has been to guide the State of Iraq through the period of adolescence to the full status of manhood, and in this connection let me express at once on behalf of my Government our sincere thanks to you, Mr. President, and to the Prime Minister of Iraq for the reference made to the discharge by my country of its duty under the mandate.

This moment is historic because Iraq is the first State to emerge from the mandatory régime. When the mandatory régime was instituted, when Article 22 of the Covenant was drafted and discussed, there were not wanting critics and cynics who hinted that the whole mandatory system had been devised merely as a cloak for colonisation and annexation. All who are interested in upholding the Covenant of the League and of maintaining in its entirety the principle for which the League of Nations stands are entitled to rejoice to day that the admission of Iraq as a Member to the League is a sufficiently emphatic answer to that suspicion.

There is also the most significant circumstance, already mentioned by the President, that Iraq is the first Arab country to join the League. We all of us believe that, in this step with which we are associating ourselves to-day, Iraq is helping us to make an advance towards that ideal of the League as the universal and all-embracing institution which we wish it to be. I venture to express the confident hope that the Government and people of Iraq will, in this new position of responsibility and authority, exert ever-increasing influence in that part of the world in maintaining the causes of progress and of peace.

Lastly, there is an historic reflection which I permit myself, and, indeed, we should be dull in the historic sense to-day if we did not find something infinitely striking in the fact that we are admitting, by the path of Article 22, to full membership of the League the newest of States but one of the most ancient of countries. I recall the famous phrase employed by the English philosopher Francis Bacon when he was dwelling on the mysterious continuity of human life. He wrote *Antiquitas sæculi juvenus mundi*, or, as it has been expressed in English by a Victorian poet :

"We are ancients of the earth,
And in the morning of the times."

We salute our new comrade, recalling that, for many of us, the country over which His Majesty the King of Iraq rules is the country that has been the source of religion and of civilisation for half the world, that it encloses within its boundaries the place that was the Garden of Eden, the area that was afflicted by the flood, that it can show to-day the records of Father Abraham and Ur of the Chaldees, records of Nebuchadnezzar and the Kingdom of Babylon, records still remain of the ancient empire of Nineveh and Sennacherib.

It is with a deep sense of the continuity of history and of the spirit which may make all things new that we salute the State of Iraq and welcome it to the Assembly of the League of Nations.

In welcoming the new State and wishing it all success and prosperity in the future, let me in a concluding sentence pay a warm tribute to King Feisal and to his Ministers, without whose wise and energetic co-operation it would have been impossible, whatever might have been the goodwill on the side of the Power discharging its mandate, for the young State of Iraq in the space of no more than 12 years to qualify, as it has qualified, to take its place, as it now takes its place with the assent and approval of us all, in the comity of the League of Nations.

The representatives of Turkey, Tevfik Rustu Bey, of France (M. Bérenger), of India (the Aga Khan), of Persia (Ali Khan Foroughi), of Germany (M. von Rosenberg), of Japan (M. Nagaoka), of Italy (M. Rosso), and of Poland (M. de Modzelewski), also stressed the interest of Iraq's admission to the League, in that it was the first example of the termination of a mandatory régime, and the importance which they attached to its co-operation in the League's work. All paid a tribute to the work carried out by the Mandatory Power and congratulated the new Member of the League.

A*

2. ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

On October 3rd the Assembly proceeded to the election of three non-permanent Members of the Council. Mexico and Czechoslovakia were elected in the place of Peru and Yugoslavia, whose mandates expired this year.

Since Poland had, by a former Assembly vote, been declared re-eligible, it was re-elected by 48 out of 52 votes registered. Mexico and Czechoslovakia received 46 votes each.

These three States will be Members of the Council for a period of three years.

At this meeting the Portuguese representative, M. de Vasconcellos, pressed for the presentation, at the earliest possible moment, of the report from the Committee set up by the Council to study the present system of elections to the Council, in order that the next Assembly might put an end to a situation prejudicial to certain States.*

3. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES 4 AND 17 OF THE ASSEMBLY RULES OF PROCEDURE.

On the proposal of the Norwegian Government the Assembly amended Rules 4 and 17 of its Rules of Procedure.† In the future no proposal for the placing of a new question on the agenda and no resolution, amendment or motion may be signed by more than fifteen Members of the League.

The Norwegian Government gave the following reasons for this proposal : " It is conceivable that certain proposals might be submitted by so considerable a number of signatories that the other Members of the League would find themselves exposed to moral pressure and would hesitate to express their misgivings or doubts as regards the expediency of the proposed measure. This would particularly be the case with regard to the placing of a new question on the agenda. A proposal signed by more than half the Members of the League present would more or less settle the question in advance and would thus deprive the States Members of the League of the possibility of devoting the necessary time to a careful study of the problem raised."

4. ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PROTOCOL OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1929, CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

After a discussion in which the importance of bringing into force the amendments in the Court Statute was strongly emphasised, the

* See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 225.

† See Assembly resolutions : Annex, page 308.

Assembly adopted a resolution urging ratification by the small number of Governments which had not so far ratified the Protocol, and requesting them, if they should consider that peremptory reasons prevented them from ratifying the Protocol, to inform the League of the nature of those reasons.

5. NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.*

The Twelfth Assembly had had on its agenda the question of the nationality of women and had asked the Secretary-General to undertake an inquiry among the Governments.†

The question was: Should Articles 8 to 11 of the Hague Convention of April 12th, 1930, be submitted for revision to a new conference, or did the results of the Hague Conference represent the maximum that could be secured by general international agreement at the present juncture?

The Thirteenth Assembly noted the replies of thirty-three Governments and the supplementary observations of the Committee of Representatives of the Women's Organisations. It considered that the Hague Conference had not intended to sanction a principle contrary to the independence of the nationality of married women, but rather to put an end to certain difficulties arising from divergencies between the laws governing the matter in different countries. It further pointed out that a large number of Governments had, in their observations, expressed the opinion that Articles 8 to 11 of the Hague Convention represented the maximum degree of progress at present attainable by way of international agreement in regard to the question.

It further considered that any amendment outside the normal procedure for revision would prove impracticable and, therefore, satisfied that the entry into force of these articles would in no way prejudice further international action, the Assembly expressed the hope that the States which had already signed the Convention would introduce such legislation as might be necessary to give effect thereto and would deposit their ratifications at an early date. It felt that the question of the nationality of women was in process of evolution and was connected with the change in women's position in social, economic and political life.

The Assembly also instructed the Secretary-General to ask Governments from time to time for particulars as to the effect which they had found it possible to give to the Hague Conference's recommendation in favour of equality of treatment of the sexes in the matter of

nationality. It further requested the Council to note the information so received and to follow the development of public opinion on the question in order to determine when it might have reached a stage at which further concerted international action would be justified.

6. INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS: REGISTRATION OF TREATIES.

The Treaties and Conventions registered with the League of Nations during August and September include:

A Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Iraq (Bagdad, June 30th, 1930) presented by Great Britain;

Agreements regarding the telephone service between Germany, Austria, Hungary and the Netherlands; Germany, Italy, the Netherlands; and Switzerland; Germany, Lithuania and the Netherlands; Germany, Latvia, Lithuania and the Netherlands; and Germany, the Netherlands and Poland, all presented by the Netherlands;

An Agreement regarding the dissolution of the Mixed Anglo-German Arbitral Tribunal between Germany and Great Britain and Northern Ireland (London, July 26th, 1932) presented by Great Britain;

A Treaty of Commerce between Bolivia and the Netherlands (La Paz, May 30th, 1929) presented by the Netherlands;

A Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between Abyssinia and Japan (Addis Ababa, November 15th, 1930) presented by Japan;

A Convention between the United States and Chile for the Suppression of the smuggling of alcoholic liquor (Washington, May 27th, 1930) presented by Chile;

A Convention regarding judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation between Czechoslovakia and Turkey (Angora, March 17th, 1931) presented by Czechoslovakia;

A Convention on Commerce and Navigation between Poland and Roumania, together with a Protocol regarding the Veterinary Convention covering the importation of animals and raw animal products (Warsaw, June 23rd and 30th) presented by Poland;

An Agreement between Austria and Poland regarding the settlement of certain Austro-Hungarian pre-war debts (The Hague, January 20th, 1930) presented by Poland;

Conventions between Germany and Turkey regarding judicial relations in civil and commercial matters (Angora, May 28th, 1929), and an Extradition Treaty between the same States, both presented by Germany;

* See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 308.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 230.

Agreements between Germany and Czechoslovakia regarding the installation and working of regular airways landing in or flying without landing over the territory of the two States (Prague, April 29th, 1931) presented by Germany;

An Exchange of Notes between Germany and the United States involving an Agreement regarding air navigation (Berlin, May, 1932) presented by Germany.

A Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Law, between the United States of America and Norway (Washington, January 25th, 1929), presented by Norway;

A Treaty of Conciliation, Arbitration, and Judicial Settlement between Bulgaria and Norway (Sofia, November 26th, 1931), presented by Norway;

The Conventions adopted by the Sixth Pan-American Conference (Havana, February 20th, 1928) relating to the status of foreigners, the protection of literary and artistic property, the rules to be observed when granting the right of asylum and the rights and duties of States in case of civil war; presented the first two by Guatemala, the third by Guatemala and Panama, and the fourth by Panama.

V.—TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

I. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

(a) *Work of the Health Committee.*

The Health Committee held its nineteenth session at Geneva from October 10th to 15th, when it reviewed the various aspects of the Health Organisation's activity. It paid particular attention to two questions: the repercussions of the economic crisis on public health, and tuberculosis prophylaxis.

* * *

One sad event marked this session: the sudden death of M. O. Velghe, Vice-President of the Health Committee and President of the Permanent Committee of the *Office international d'Hygiène publique*.

M. Velghe had collaborated from its inception in the work of the Health Organisation and his sterling qualities, high ideals, and the value of his services had won him general esteem. His loss is deeply regretted by all his colleagues.

* * *

The Economic Crisis and Public Health.—The repercussions of the economic crisis on public health being a matter of concern to many countries, the Health Committee considered the part which the League Health Organisation can play in assisting the various Health Administrations.

The Committee had before it a note prepared by its President and a memorandum drawn up by the Health Section, both setting forth the situation and showing that there are at present from 50 to 60 million persons in the world affected in a greater or less degree by unemployment.

The effects of the crisis upon public health are not only apparent in an insufficiency of food—which, weakening the body, makes it easier for disease, and particularly tuberculosis, to gain hold—but often also in mental troubles.

New health problems arise out of this universal economic depression, particularly as a result of the exodus from towns and the settlement of the unemployed in allotments where sanitation is only too often defective.

The financial difficulties with which the different countries are faced has sometimes forced them to reduce the credits allocated to health work at a moment when these are particularly necessary for safeguarding public health.

After considering the documentation placed at its disposal the Health Committee felt that the League Health Organisation should, after defining the problem, settle the methods of future action.

The Committee accordingly made the following provisions:

(a) Since the various attempts made to define the problem with the assistance of mortality and morbidity statistics had afforded no conclusive results, it felt that the means of establishing more reliable criteria must be sought through study of the special methods developed in the various countries.

(b) Individual nutrition is at present the subject of certain special studies in no way national in character; these studies are, moreover, based on different systems. The Committee felt that studies of the nutritional conditions of the unemployed should be carried on under the auspices of the public health authorities. It emphasised the necessity for clinical observations, and decided to consult the experts as to the methods to be followed.

(c) The means of livelihood of the unemployed are in certain countries considerably scantier now than formerly. The way in which the slender means at their disposal can be utilised to provide sufficient nourishment both from

the point of view of quality and quantity therefore requires investigation. Hitherto a certain number of public or private health institutions have published data on this subject, but no general study has as yet been undertaken. The Health Committee also felt that it was necessary to facilitate the exchange of information and to consult the public health administrations concerned regarding the best way in which reduced means can be used to provide adequate nourishment.

(d) Certain Governments and private institutions had often reduced their public health budgets to a great extent. The Health Committee therefore felt that it would be as well to consider what measures were most suitable to safeguard public health in times of crisis; it arranged to summon representatives of five or six countries possessing well-organised public health services with a view to seeking the best methods for co-ordinating the efforts of all public and private health institutions.

The Committee also considered the "distress programmes" drawn up by some health administrations, the object of these programmes is to ward against the harmful effects of budgetary reduction, and to enable health authorities methodically to concentrate their activities without affecting their essential services.

(e) The exodus from cities and the settlement of the unemployed in allotments where sanitation is defective also occupied the Committee's attention. This movement brings with it problems of food supplies, medical assistance, health organisation, sewerage, and refuse disposal. The Committee also decided to study the effects of this exodus upon public health and will consult certain housing and colonisation experts on the matter.

(f) Experience has proved that the crisis has certain psychological repercussions; the Committee accordingly decided to undertake a study of this subject. It asked certain members to supply information on this subject from their countries (Germany, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Denmark, Spain).

(g) The Committee lastly felt that it would be desirable to secure the collaboration of the International Labour Office in its work, and asked the Council to take steps to that end.

Tuberculosis.—The Health Committee considered and adopted the conclusions of a report on the general principles of tuberculosis prophylaxis, prepared by its Reporting Committee.

The first point brought out in the discussion was that, tuberculosis being a social disease,

the anti-tuberculosis campaign is an activity of social hygiene. Its epidemiology and statistics appear to demonstrate that tuberculosis mortality in the majority of European countries began its more or less regular decline at different dates, but at longer or shorter periods antecedent to the discovery of the tubercle bacillus and the organisation of specific anti-tuberculosis activities, and that that decline accompanied the progress of general civilisation. The evolution of medicine and hygiene has hastened that decline, but the importance of social factors, such as nutrition, housing, and education, must not be forgotten.

The influence of social insurance in the anti-tuberculosis campaign is becoming greater and greater; such insurance has become a great economic and social force.

The prevention of tuberculosis rests at present on the close co-operation of preventive medicine and new methods of treatment. The prophylactic value of treatment by means of the isolation of infectious cases and the cures of open cases effected is well established. One should therefore avoid appearing to set up an opposition between treatment and preventive medicine.

The Health Organisation gave lengthy consideration to the organisation of sanatoria. The progress of therapy has revolutionised the old sanatoria, and has transformed them into centres of medico-surgical treatment. There should be no question of limiting the number of special hospitals for tuberculosis as long as any country does not have the required number of beds.

The problem of post-sanatorial treatment is far from solution, and will doubtless be referred by the Committee to a sub-commission.

The Health Committee holds that the dispensary is the most vital of specific anti-tuberculosis measures. In the past, the principle that the dispensary should give no treatment was generally held. The strict maintenance of that principle in the future would appear to be difficult. Treatment is so closely allied to prevention that, in certain circumstances, notably in districts lacking doctors, the sick would not be receiving medical care unless treatment were given at the dispensary.

There were some differences of opinion concerning B.C.G. The reasons for this were tradition and reservations due to a lively sense of responsibility and national psychology. The Committee nevertheless agreed that facts showed vaccination by this method to be innocuous; ever widening experience was proving its efficacy. In view of the increasing

use of this method and the beneficial results obtained in a number of countries the Committee considered that research and application should be stimulated in order that the indications, technique, and supervision thereof could be gauged in greater detail.

The Committee considered it would be desirable to complete the report on certain points—for instance, the training and rôle of health visitors, special organisation of the treatment and prevention of lupus, which is based especially on the detection of early cases, tuberculosis of bovine origin, hygiene of milk, and the technique of pasteurisation.

Malaria.

The Committee noted the report of the Malaria Commission and approved the work of its last session (October 12th to 14th), which covered the following points:

(a) Co-operation with Siam and China.

Siam.—At the request of the Siamese Government the Chairman of the Malaria Commission had, in 1930, delegated Dr. L. Anigstein, a member of the Commission, to carry out an epidemiological study in Siam.

The Director of the Siamese Health Administration had asked for the opinion of the Malaria Commission on the results of the inquiry, on which it was intended to base the future anti-malarial organisation in Siam.

The Health Committee approved the Commission's conclusions and Dr. Anigstein's report, both of which it forwarded to the Siamese Government.

China.—In October, 1931, the Secretary of the Malaria Commission was requested to assist in the organisation of the Malaria Division of the Central Field Health Station at Nanking. The Malaria Commission took note of his report, which deals, on the one hand, with the anti-malaria services and the programme of the Malaria Division, and, on the other, with a study of malaria prevalence in the Yangtse Valley.

The Health Committee learned with satisfaction that collaboration between that Division and the Malaria Commission had thus been established.

(b) International Malaria Courses.

The Malaria Commission considered the proposal that courses similar to those at present held under its auspices should be established in the Far East, on the ground that it is often difficult and expensive for the Administrations of Far Eastern countries to send their medical officers to the courses given in Europe.

These new courses will be held in Singapore under the technical direction of the School of Medicine in that city, and under the administrative direction of the Eastern Bureau of the Health Organisation.

The Health Committee endorsed this view.

(c) Inquiry into the Supply of Quinine in relation to the World Prevalence of Malaria.

The Malaria Commission noted the results of this inquiry, to which 108 sanitary administrations had replied. The results have revealed the evident disproportion between the probable number of cases and the number of patients who receive treatment. The inquiry also brought out the difficulties encountered by the Sanitary Administrations in endeavouring to develop its work in this direction.

The Health Committee considered that the documentation thus collected might well serve as the basis for a future conference on quinine which would, it hoped, be held as soon as possible.

(d) Treatment of Malaria.

At its 1928 session, the Malaria Commission considered certain questions relating to treatment in regard to efficacy and cost.

Since that time, its studies have for the most part been concerned with the therapeutic value of secondary alkaloids and mixtures of the alkaloids of cinchona, and in particular of a standard preparation known as "Totaquina," still under investigation, which has the advantage of costing less than quinine.

The Health Committee felt that the formulæ for the bacteriological and chemical methods of analysing totaquina should be sent to the authorities responsible for pharmacopeias in the various countries concerned, and invited the Malaria Commission to continue its study of the therapeutic value of this preparation in the treatment of human malaria.

Opium and other Dangerous Drugs.

Under this heading, two requests for information had been addressed to the Health Committee, the first from the Central Opium Board, the second from the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium.

The first dealt with the new method of presenting data on the consumption of opiates of various countries, the second with heroin pills consumed in the Far East under the misleading name of anti-opium pills.

On the first point the Committee noted an expert opinion and stated that while this method possessed certain practical advantages, the results achieved showed nearly the same

difference between the consumption of the various States as had been obtained by other methods. In these circumstances it considered it useless to recommend its adoption to Governments. It realised the advantages to be obtained were the Advisory Committee in a position to recommend to States a model method for the preparation of data on the actual consumption of opiates.

On the second point the Committee decided to submit specimens of heroin pills supplied through the intermediary of the British Government to a chemical and clinical study, to be entrusted to Professor Knafl-Lenz, of Vienna.

Conference of Directors of Public Health Services in certain African Territories.

In February, 1932, the Government of the Union of South Africa inquired of the Health Organisation whether it would be willing to summon a conference of Directors of Public Health Services in certain African territories with the object of discussing public health matters of common concern to the various districts of Central and South Africa and in need of urgent solution. The matter placed in the forefront for study was the practical application of the chapter dealing with yellow fever in the new International Sanitary Convention on Air Navigation. This Convention was drawn up by the Permanent Committee of the *Office international d'Hygiène publique* in April, 1932, and it is at the moment of particular importance in view of the fact that new air routes are now crossing Africa from north to south and from east to west.

The South African Government also feels that the Conference should consider the unification of measures for preventing the introduction of small-pox by vessels coming from British India, the problems raised by the character of plague endemicity in certain districts of South Africa, and various sanitary problems arising in rural areas. The Health Committee acceded to the request, and the Conference will be held at Cape Town on November 15th, 1932.

The following countries have notified their intention to send representatives: Union of South Africa, West Africa (Nigeria, Gold Coast), East Africa (Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar), Portuguese Colonies (Mozambique, Angola), British India, Spanish Colonies (Fernando Po, Mounix).

The Health Committee has requested Sir George Buchanan to represent it at the Conference, while the technical secretarial work will be undertaken by the Director of the

Singapore Bureau. Further, at the request of the Health Organisation, the Rockefeller Foundation has been good enough to place at the disposal of the Conference the services of Dr. Sawyer in the capacity of an expert. During their stay in Cape Town, the delegates will be the guests of the Government.

Venereal Diseases.

The Health Committee had entrusted to a Reporting Committee on Venereal Diseases the task of ascertaining the guiding principles which at present govern the anti-venereal campaign as far as diagnosis, treatment, and administrative regulations are concerned.

The first part of this study, now completed, is based on the results of the laboratory conferences convened by the Health Organisation at Copenhagen and Montevideo, where the different methods utilised in the serodiagnosis of syphilis were compared. The Health Committee approved the conclusions of its Reporting Committee on this subject.

Study of Deafness.

On June 15th, 1932, the Government of the Union of South Africa asked that the Health Organisation should carry out an international study of deafness similar to that undertaken on blindness. As the question is at present the subject of an official study in the United Kingdom, the Health Committee thought it would be premature to set up a Commission of experts before examining the results of this study.

Investigation into the Nutritional Problem in Chile.

On March 16th, 1932, the Chilean Government requested the co-operation of the technical organisations of the League, and, in particular, of the Health Organisation, in the study of the nutritional problem in Chile.

On May 9th, 1932, the Council invited the Health and Economic Committees to consider that request and asked the Chilean Government to furnish all information which might be useful in the preliminary study of the problem.

The Health Committee is now proceeding with this preliminary study.

Collaboration with the Ministry and Institute of Hygiene of Czechoslovakia.

In 1931 the Czechoslovak Minister of Public Health and Physical Education requested the collaboration of the Health Organisation in studying health conditions in certain parts of Slovakia and Sub-Carpathian Russia.

In September, 1932, a further communication was received from the Minister, asking for the

continued collaboration of the Health Organisation in the application of the findings of the study. The Health Committee decided to afford this collaboration, for which the plan had been drawn up by the Czecho-slovak Health authorities.

* * *

(b) *Work of the Assembly.*

The Assembly also reviewed the work of the Health Organisation during the past year.* This Organisation, which had in its opening stages to select the health problems most suitable for solution along international lines, has passed through a second stage, that of technical studies (research into the question of leprosy, immunisation against diphtheria, etc.) from which general conclusions can be drawn. Its work has now entered upon a third stage, that of action (co-operation lent to the Greek Government in setting up its sanitary re-organisation scheme; action taken upon Bolivia's request for a study of health conditions in that country; work of the Permanent Commission on Bacteriological Standardisation; co-ordination of the campaign against epidemics in China, etc.). It will be remembered in connection with this last point that as a result of the appeal launched by the Assembly in September, 1931, urging the public in all countries to give tangible proof of its sympathy with the flood victims in China, the Health Organisation was instructed by the Council to co-ordinate the international anti-epidemic campaign and to transmit to the States Members a request from the Chinese Government for medical staff and sanitary material. The Governments of Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands East Indies, Egypt, Indo-China, the Netherlands, Poland, Siam, Spain, and Switzerland generously responded to this appeal and sent to China sera, pharmaceutical products, field laboratories, medical staff, and food, while the Japanese Government and Japanese institutions gave generous help in the form both of staff and of transport facilities until September, 1931. The Assembly expressed its thanks to these various Governments.

During the course of the discussions, various delegates of Eastern countries paid special tribute to the effective work accomplished by the Eastern Bureau in the campaign against epidemic diseases. The delegate of India, supported by the delegate of China, expressed the hope that, as soon as financial possibilities permitted, the Health Organisation would con-

vene in the East a Conference on rural hygiene similar to the European Conference held in 1931. The Assembly accordingly invited the Health Committee to consider the feasibility of convening such a conference and to present a report on the subject at its next session.

The Assembly expressed its gratification that Governments and their health administrations were increasingly contributing and resorting to the experience of the Health Organisation.

2. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

(a) *Work of the Economic and Financial Organisation.*†

A discussion took place in the Second Committee of the Assembly on the economic and financial work of the League. In reviewing the world situation, the Committee noted that the widespread abandonment of the gold standard had, in some cases, afforded temporary relief, shortly followed, however, by a further collapse in gold prices and a corresponding increase in the burden of all gold debts. To remedy this state of affairs—the Governments had resorted to various measures: imposition or increase of customs duties, import provisions and quotas, control of dealings in foreign exchange, etc. These provisions had, however, often produced effects contrary to those expected in that they led to reprisals. A veritable race in economic armaments had ensued. International trade was shrinking, business falling off, unemployment increasing as was proved by the economic statistics of all countries. The situation to-day was more serious than it had been in 1931.

The Second Committee was, however, able to draw attention to certain signs of improvement in international trade, in raw material and stock exchange prices. Such events as the Lausanne and Stresa Conferences and the covening of the World Monetary and Economic Conference, too, gave grounds for hope.

Convinced that the grave problems of the hour raised by the crisis could only find a solution in the effective and immediate international co-operation, the Assembly considered that the most urgent task before the coming Monetary and Economic Conference was to seek all practicable means of eliminating as speedily as possible the various obstacles hampering international trade and to facilitate the adjustments necessary for monetary stability and the restoration of credit. It addressed an urgent and solemn appeal to the Governments

* See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 309.

† See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 309.

to be represented at the Monetary and Economic Conference asking them to make every contribution in their power to the solution of the present difficulties and to enlighten public opinion as to the need for making the concessions required for an international economic understanding, that being the sole means of restoring a normal situation.

A. *Economic Activities.*

The work of the Economic Organisation included the establishment of procedure for the friendly settlement of economic disputes between States, the achievement of a unified customs nomenclature, studies on economic agreement and various questions regarding production (coal, the motor-car industry, timber, hops, tobacco), and the completion of three draft veterinary conventions; the campaign against contagious animal diseases, the transit of animals, meat and other products of animal origin, and the export and import of animal products other than meat.

The Assembly expressed the hope that an international conference of diplomatic representatives could be summoned during 1933 to discuss the three draft conventions mentioned above. It also asked the Economic Committee to keep the States concerned informed of the progress of its studies on veterinary problems raised by the trade in cattle and meat, especially where the import of meat and live stock was concerned.

B. *Financial Work.*

During the past twelve months of financial crisis the task which fell to the Financial Organisation of the League has been particularly heavy. One after the other Governments have turned to it for assistance and advice. Members of the Financial Committee have visited Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary and Roumania. The Committee has further considerably contributed to the solution of certain general problems by the publication of the report of its Gold Delegation, the conclusions of which were, in general, approved by the Governing Body of the Bank for International Settlements.

The Secretariat of the League of Nations has, further, been asked to give its technical assistance to the Lithuanian Government and to study the financial aspects of the Liberian question.

1. *Work of the Financial Committee.*

During its last session, held at Geneva from September 19th to October 7th, the Financial

Committee dealt with the situation in Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary and Roumania.

The Council considered this work at its meeting of October 13th.

(a) *Situation in Austria.*—The rapporteur to the Council, M. Andvord (Norway), recalled that, following the stringent measures taken by the Austrian Government after consultation with the Financial Committee, the financial situation had considerably improved. The deficit which seemed so likely in September, 1931, had not materialised and the budget was now balanced. On the other hand, the foreign exchange question continued to give grounds for anxiety, the transfers for foreign debt payments, public and private, having been suspended.

The rapporteur to the Council regretted to have to announce that this suspension also applied to transfers for the service of the 1923 Loan issued under the League's auspices.

He voiced the unanimous view of the Council when he emphasised that the Austrian Government must make every attempt, in co-operation with the National Bank of Austria, as soon as possible to resume and give priority to the transfers for this loan.

Further, with a view to consolidating and extending the progress achieved, the rapporteur drew the Council's attention to the necessity, upon which the Financial Committee had laid emphasis, for securing at a very early date the international assistance to Austria contemplated at Lausanne and in the Protocol approved by the Council on July 15th, 1932.*

The Council therefore drew the attention of the Governments, guarantors of the 1923 Loan, to the importance of their participation in this work of assistance to Austria.

The French representative, M. Paganon, said that his Government had, with a view to affording the assistance envisaged in the Protocol of July 15th, 1932, at the earliest possible moment, laid before the Chamber on July 16th a Bill concerning the ratification of this Act.

Mr. Eden (United Kingdom) after emphasising the necessity for achieving the greatest possible measure of international co-operation without delay, added that his Government had every hope that the other States, guarantors of the 1923 Loan, would shortly participate in the new loan. The German representative, M. von Rosenberg, reiterated the reservations previously submitted by his Government.

(b) *Situation in Bulgaria.*—The rapporteur to the Council pointed out that the financial

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 227.

situation in Bulgaria remained very serious. The Government had taken certain measures by which it hoped to reduce the budget deficit. The Financial Committee felt, however, that radical re-organisation of the whole financial administration was necessary if budget equilibrium were to be restored.

In the matter of the foreign exchange situation, Bulgaria constituted a typical example of the harm caused by the establishment of exchange restrictions and other obstacles to international trade. The natural markets for Bulgarian export products were in Central Europe and were to-day to a very considerable extent closed owing to these and other restrictions. As a result Bulgarian exports had fallen from 3,400,000 leva to 1,800,000 leva during the first seven months of the year. Imports had shown a lesser reduction, from 2,800,000 leva to 2,000,000 leva. Foreign exchange obtained from exports by the National Bank had fallen from 4,200,000 leva in 1931 to 1,500,000 leva in the first seven months of 1932. It must, however, be noted that part of the exchange so obtained was at present blocked abroad on special accounts. The rapporteur further pointed out that the Financial Committee once more condemned the system of clearing agreements.

The Bulgarian representative, M. Stephanoff, declared that his Government would continue to make every endeavour to balance the budget, but that all the measures taken to create fresh revenue and to effect economies were meeting with insurmountable difficulties owing to the serious fall in budget receipts due to the economic depression. The Government would continue the reorganisation of the financial administration and, in so doing, would have recourse to the assistance of the League Commissioner. He added that, in spite of the tightening up of the exchange control measures, the amount of foreign currency at the disposal of the National Bank of Bulgaria showed a continuous decrease owing to the drop in the price of agricultural products and the obstacles in the way of international trade. Finally, he pointed out that his Government might find it impossible in view of this situation to continue to effect transfers on the same scale as at present.

(c) *Situation in Greece.*—The rapporteur to the Council pointed out that since July the Greek Government had held conversations with certain groups of foreign bond-holders and had concluded provisional arrangements. The Greek representative, M. Raphael, confirmed that the conversations which the Greek Finance Minister had held in London and Paris had reached certain results. He stated that the Greek

Government was glad thus to have been able to give effect to the Council's recommendation of April 15th asking it to establish touch with the bond-holders, who alone were qualified to accept the concessions required by the present circumstances in the matter of their lawful rights.

(d) *Situation in Hungary.*—The rapporteur to the Council pointed out that the situation in Hungary had shown no very marked improvement since June last. He recalled that the Financial Committee, after emphasising the necessity for effecting further economies if the budget were to be balanced, had drawn attention to the dangers to which legislation of a general character—such as that envisaged by the Hungarian Government to protect the interests of certain categories of agricultural debtors—might give rise in connection with future agricultural credits.

(e) *Situation in Roumania.*—The rapporteur to the Council explained that, following the letter addressed by the Roumanian Government on July 18th, 1932, to the Secretary-General asking for the technical assistance of the League in applying its scheme for financial reform and economic reconstruction of the country, the Financial Committee had sent a delegation to Roumania to study the situation on the spot. During its stay in Roumania this delegation had discussed with the Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet the form which the proposed co-operation might take, as well as the existing financial situation and certain other urgent financial problems.

The Financial Committee had had fresh conversations on these questions with the Roumanian Government representatives at Geneva and had drawn up with them the text of an agreement in which were laid down the principles on the basis of which the Financial Committee might recommend the organisation of technical co-operation with Roumania. The Roumanian Government had expressed a wish to reconsider this text.

RESIGNATION OF M. SUVICH.

M. Suvich, recently appointed Under-Secretary of State in the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, has been compelled to resign his membership of the Financial Committee, to which he has belonged for some years, and of which he has been President since January, 1931. His place has been taken by M. Cesar Tumedei.

The Council expressed its thanks to M. Suvich for his constant co-operation for many years past in the League's work.

(b) *Memorial from the League Loans Committee.*

The Council, at its meeting of October 3rd, received through the British Government a Memorial from the League Loans Committee, which has been set up in London. In this Memorial the Committee made certain claims by reason of the special status of these loans and the purposes for which they were issued. It pointed out that they had served to promote the post-war reconstruction of Europe and that their main object was to provide means for ensuring the economic and monetary stability of the countries which had suffered by the war. But for the issue of these loans, the service of previous loans could, in many cases, hardly have been resumed, nor would subsequent lenders have invested funds as they did in the countries concerned.

The Committee further emphasised that the investing public had in every case received in the most explicit terms the assurance that the highest security had been provided and that all possible provisions had been taken under League supervision to protect this security.

The Committee nevertheless pointed out that the service of several loans issued under League auspices was no longer being maintained by the debtor. Such defaults dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the League's reconstruction policy and had seriously shaken the confidence of the investing public in the League loans. It therefore requested the Council to consider the question and to apply forthwith such remedies as it had at its command in order to restore confidence and to continue the beneficent work of reconstruction upon which it had been engaged.

The Council set up a Sub-Committee composed of the representatives of France, the United Kingdom, Italy and Spain to study the Committee's Memorial.

At its meeting of October 7th the Council noted this Sub-Committee's report and approved its conclusions. It adopted the following resolution:

"The Council,

"Takes note of the Memorial dated July 18th, 1932, addressed to it by the League Loans Committee (London) regarding the position of the loans issued under the auspices of the League of Nations and of the report of the Sub-Committee appointed by it on October 3rd;

"Recalling the circumstances in which these loans were issued and the fact that the approval and support of the Council were essential for their issue;

"Realises the special responsibility which lies upon it in connection with these loans and reaffirms the very grave concern with which it

views the continued failure of certain States to meet their obligations thereunder;

"Has noted the statements issued by the Hungarian Government on August 4th regarding the service of the Hungarian Loan of 1924 and by the Austrian Government on August 25th, regarding the service of Austrian foreign loans;

"Is glad to observe that, in accordance with its recommendation the Bulgarian and Greek Governments have, in order to avoid unilateral default, got in contact with bondholders' representatives, as a result of which proposals for provisional arrangements have been recommended to the bondholders;

"Trust that every effort will be made by all these States to resume payment in full at as early a date as possible of the obligations which they have subscribed;

"Requests the Financial Committee to give particular attention to the League's responsibilities in this connection, and to advise whether any further action can be taken at the present time;

"Declares its opinion that any country which is in default on a loan issued under the auspices of the League should avail itself fully of the technical help of League advisers and should keep the Council fully informed of the position through its Financial Committee."

(c) *Relations between the League of Nations and the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.*

The Council, at its meeting of October 3rd, made the arrangements for future relations between the League and the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. The Council considered that since the Institute was the body best qualified to advise the League on agricultural matters it would be well for the League to ensure its co-operation whenever called upon to deal with questions either directly or indirectly connected with agriculture. Similarly, whenever the Institute should contemplate collective action likely to affect international relations, such action should be brought into line with that of the League.

In order to co-ordinate the work of the two Organisations, and with a view to their effective and useful co-operation under the best possible conditions, the Council adopted certain measures which are only to become operative when the Secretary-General has been notified of the agreement of the International Institute of Agriculture.

The Italian representative, M. Biancheri, pointed out that collaboration between the League and the Institute would concentrate the efforts of the two bodies.

M. de Michelis, President of the Institute, was convinced that his colleagues on the Permanent Committee of the Institute would rejoice at the establishment of closer and more regular relations with the League.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

Work of the Communications and Transit Organisation.

The Assembly noted that the Communications and Transit Organisation had done effective work during the year and had made considerable progress.*

The main questions dealt with were calendar reform, barriers to maritime navigation, the negotiability of documents for the transport of goods by rail, air transport co-operation, the unification of transport statistics, measures to be taken in cases of serious interruption of means of communication used for international transit, and public works and national technical equipment.

On this last point the Assembly noted the studies undertaken by the special Committee instructed to consider the schemes for public

works laid before it by the Governments† and to submit a report to the Council. This Committee had examined the various schemes and retained a certain number, among them some of those submitted by the Governments of Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Poland and Yugoslavia.

The Communications and Transit Organisation had also lent its assistance to China during the past year. Experts had visited the country with a view to advising the Government on various important technical problems and engineers had been sent to China as representatives of the Organisation to assist in the preparation and direction of public works—road construction and hydraulic works.

The Assembly was glad to note that this co-operation had been afforded and expressed its conviction that it would meet with every success.

VI.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

I. WORK OF THE INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION ORGANISATION.*

The Assembly reviewed the work of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and noted the important results achieved in the course of the year.† This work covered a very wide field, including education, the revision of school text-books, wireless, moral disarmament, employment of workers' spare time, the re-organisation of education in China, the scientific study of international relations, the intellectual rôle of the press, preservation of historic monuments, educational films, etc.

The Assembly emphasised the importance which it attached to the efforts made by the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation towards establishing some procedure likely to promote the revision of school text-books. It also drew attention to the assistance rendered by the Organisation in the study of the educational problems with which China is faced, and in the re-organisation work which the Chinese Government is proposing to undertake.

With regard to the study of the problem of moral disarmament, the Assembly was gratified to note the co-operation which the Organisation had been able to afford to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. It expressed the hope that this Conference would find it possible, on the completion of its

work, to include among the documents setting forth its results an act which would assist the efforts to bring about the intellectual *rapprochement* of the peoples.

Realising the important part played by the press in the education of the masses, the Assembly requested the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation to seek the most effective means of promoting this. It invited the Organisation to study in consultation with the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation and representative journalists, the methods by which the press might contribute to a better understanding between the peoples by perfecting their knowledge. Finally, the Assembly emphasised the importance which it attached to the questions connected with the education of youth in the aims of the League and the development of an international spirit

* * *

The Assembly also took note of the report of the Governing Body of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute, and expressed its satisfaction with the systematic development of that Institute's work and, in particular, with the results of the numerous inquiries already completed or at present in progress. It trusted that the Institute would, by extending its activity in those spheres which had already engaged the attention of the League, be able to promote the use of the cinema in favour of the League's work.

* See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 310.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 230.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 252.

2. INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.*

The Assembly considered a draft Protocol for facilitating the international circulation of films of an educational character, in particular by according them exemption from customs duties and accessory charges in respect of import, transit, and export.

During the discussion on this subject in the Second Committee the various delegations expressed their general approval of the broad outline of the scheme drawn up by a special Sub-Committee on the basis of a first draft prepared by a committee of experts convened by the International Educational Cinematographic Institute; many of them emphasised the necessity for achieving an international

agreement with the shortest possible delay.

The Assembly, which supported this point of view, asked the Council to convene a meeting of government delegates at whatever time it might consider most suitable and, if possible, during the forthcoming Extraordinary session of the Assembly. At this meeting the delegates, in possession of full powers, would be called upon to decide whether the proposed convention should be opened for signature to all the Members of the League and States non-Members.

On October 13th the Council considered the Assembly resolution and asked its President, after consultation with the Italian representative on the Council and the Secretary-General, to convene a meeting of plenipotentiary delegates at the earliest possible date.

VII.—ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

1. THE PRESS AND THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.†

The question of the co-operation of the Press in the organisation of peace was the subject of an Assembly resolution in 1931. In execution of this resolution the Council had asked for a report on the dissemination of false information of a nature to disturb the peace and good understanding between nations.

The question had meanwhile been discussed by the Copenhagen Conference of Directors of Government Press Bureaux and Press Representatives.

The Secretary-General, too, had consulted the various press organisations.

With this documentation and the results of the Copenhagen Conference before it, the Assembly‡ expressed the hope that a future Conference organised on similar lines might give effect to some of the suggestions, in particular those regarding the need for greater abundance of accurate information, of true freedom of the press, and of co-operation between the press organs of various countries.

The Assembly further advocated the fullest possible publicity for the League's work and recommended to the favourable consideration of the Chairman of all League Committees the earlier and more complete distribution of docu-

ments. It expressed a hope that the Secretariat of the League would continue to develop by all the means at its disposal the prompt supply to the press of the fullest possible information concerning the League's work.

2. COLLABORATION OF WOMEN IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

Following upon a resolution of the Twelfth Assembly the Secretary-General had consulted the women's organisations on the possibility of increasing the collaboration which women could bring to the work of the League.

The Thirteenth Assembly,§ acknowledging the work done by women for the League, noted that the women's organisations were unanimous in declaring that equal status between men and women was an essential condition for the collaboration of women in the work of the League, and that they felt that such collaboration could be most effectively exercised through the competent official organs of the League and of the Governments.

The Assembly reminded the States Members of Article 7 of the Covenant, which had in view the possibility for the Governments to appoint competent women to Assembly delegations and League Conferences, for the Council to appoint competent women as assessors and experts on technical League Committees and for the Secretary-General to include them in the higher posts of the Secretariat.

* See Assembly resolution: Annex, page 312.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 249.

‡ See Assembly resolution: Annex, page 312.

§ See Assembly resolution: Annex, page 312.

VIII.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. MANDATES.

The Assembly reviewed the work carried out during the past year by the Mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission, and the Council in execution of Article 22 of the Covenant.*

Observing that the mandatory system had continued to produce satisfactory results, the Assembly noted with particular gratification the progress realised under the mandatory régime in Iraq thanks to which this country had achieved full independence and had been admitted to membership of the League.

It further considered that it was undesirable in future to maintain, even as an exceptional measure, the Twelfth Assembly's decision to reduce the annual sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission from two to one, since the fulfilment of the task assigned to the League under Article 22 of the Covenant would thus be seriously hampered.†

Frontier between Iraq and Syria.

At its meeting of October 3rd the Council noted the conclusions of the Committee appointed "to collect full information and particulars on the spot with a view to enabling the Council to delimit the frontier between Iraq and Syria."‡

On the proposal of its rapporteur, M. Yevtitch (Yugoslavia), the Council stated its readiness to adopt the line between Iraq and Syria unanimously proposed by the Commission of Inquiry and the line indicated by the majority in the Sinjar area.

Before taking any final decision it requested the Mandates Commission to state as soon as possible its opinion on the matter from the point of view of the interests of the territories affected.

It recommended to the parties the conclusion of agreements with a view to settling questions connected with the frontier régime and seasonal migration in accordance with local custom.

The French representative, M. Paganon, said that his Government accepted the rapporteur's proposals. The League had once more had the merit of rendering a friendly solution possible, and had proved the value and efficacy of its methods. He thanked the members of the Commission of Inquiry and paid a tribute to the memory of Colonel de Reynier, who had died while carrying out work for the Commission.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) associated himself with all that the French representative had said. A statement detailing the points to be covered by the Neighbourly Relations Agreement referred to in the Report had already been initialled on behalf of the parties. M. Yevtitch's report had referred to the need for constituting a Demarcation Commission with sufficiently wide powers to take into account local needs and the possible inaccuracy of maps upon which the Commission of Inquiry had drawn its suggested line. The two Governments were agreed that it would be well for this Demarcation Commission to have a neutral Chairman.

The Council requested its President to appoint the Chairman in question.

2. DANZIG.

Appointment of a High Commissioner of the League of Nations at Danzig.

The Council at its meeting of October 15th appointed M. Helmer Rosting, Chief of the Bureau of the Administrative Commissions Section in the League Secretariat, as acting High Commissioner at Danzig until December 1st, 1932.

IX.—PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

I. WORK OF THE ASSEMBLY.

On the motion of the German representative, the work of the League regarding the protection of minorities was the subject of a long discussion in the Sixth Committee.

There were certain differences of opinion

* See Assembly resolution: Annex, page 312.

† The credits necessary for holding two sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission during 1933 have been adopted by the Assembly.

‡ See Monthly Summary, 1931, Vol. XI., No. 12, page 332.

with regard to the competence of the Assembly and the Sixth Committee in the matter. In the name of the delegations of Greece, Poland, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav representative declared that, under the Minority Treaties placed under League guarantee, the right to judge whether they were being properly applied was reserved for the competence of the Council alone.

Several delegations emphasised that it was essential that a solution of the problem should be sought in constant co-operation and mutual

confidence between the majority and the minorities in each country. The Committee had in 1930 been in unanimous agreement on this point.

The Polish delegation held that the League's task in regard to the protection of minorities could never give complete satisfaction to the moral conscience of the world until the claims of minorities came to be inspired solely by reasons connected with their object and until all minorities were protected. This delegation also felt that the Sixth Committee could with advantage give its opinion in the case of minorities not protected by special treaties.

Various delegations submitted observations regarding the question raised by the German representative at the May session of the Council.*

The German delegation, supported by other delegations, maintained that the act of requesting the insertion on the Council's agenda of a question already submitted to a Minorities Committee for consideration was in accordance with the provisions of the Minority Treaties. It feared that any restriction of the right and duty of Members of the Council to submit to the latter infractions or dangers of infractions of the Treaties would have the effect of weakening the system of minorities' protection. It maintained that the responsibility for taking a step of this kind should be left to each Member of the Council.

Other delegations for various reasons expressed the view that it would be desirable that Members of the Council should, save in really exceptional cases, refrain from asking that questions under examination by Minorities Committees should be placed on the Council's agenda so long as this examination had not been completed. Some delegations urged the necessity in this connection of allowing the committee system to be developed and modified so as to permit of the maximum results.

The German delegation advocated a method of procedure likely to ensure more effective protection of minorities. It also proposed the creation of an advisory body consisting of persons independent of the States who had signed minority undertakings and which could advise the Minority Committees or the Council. Other delegations refused to consider this idea, stating that they could not do so unless the protection of minorities were extended to cover all the States Members of the League.

Certain delegations emphasised the great importance of publicity in regard to the protection of minorities. According to the German

delegate the number of committee decisions rendered public had constituted only a very small fraction of the total decisions taken, and related almost exclusively to questions of slight importance or to matters in which the opinion formulated was favourable to the Government concerned. The Yugoslav delegation explained that the governments concerned were sometimes obliged to refuse publication because the petitions in question contained, in their opinion, elements of propaganda.

Observations were also made during the discussion to the effect that the provision in the Madrid resolution relating to the constitution of Minorities Committees of five members should be interpreted in as broad a sense as possible and that—as is also contemplated in the Madrid resolution—the Committees should hold meetings between Council sessions more often than had hitherto been the case.

Certain delegations emphasised how important it was for Minorities Committees to make use of any information they considered appropriate and to bear in mind that it was in their power to hear petitioners and to consult experts.

The Norwegian delegation suggested that the members of a Minorities Committee who ask for a question to be placed on the Council's agenda should, within the limits of the existing rules, at the same time furnish the Council with a statement of the ground on which they based their action.

2. WORK OF THE COUNCIL.

The Council, too, dealt at its sixty-ninth session with various minority questions.

Protection of Minorities in Poland.

Application of Agrarian Reform.†

On the proposal of its rapporteur, M. Nagaoka, the Japanese representative, the Council decided at its meeting of October 13th to adjourn its consideration of this question until its next session, since the Committee of Three set up in May last had not yet completed its work.

Protection of Minorities in German Upper Silesia.

Petitions from the Union of Poles in Germany.

The Council had received, in May last, two petitions from the Union of Poles in Germany on the subject of the situation of the Polish minority in German Upper Silesia, and had adjourned the examination of this matter.†

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 161.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 161.

At its meeting of October 13th the Council noted and adopted the conclusions of the report submitted by the Japanese representative. This report explained that the complaints had mainly to do with the attitude of the German authorities towards the minority, in particular with regard to the issue of passports and permits, education, local government administration, elections to the legislature and other matters. The petitioners considered that the position of the minority, instead of improving, had recently changed for the worse and that, as a result of the hostile attitude of the administrative authorities and the general public in Germany the minority was placed in a position of inferiority, as compared with the majority, in every sphere of life and activity.

The report further pointed out that the German Government denied these allegations stating that any failure to develop relations between the majority and the minority in an atmosphere of calm and good understanding, as the German Government would have desired, was due to the attitude of the minority.

Turning to the cases in point the report stated that the majority of these had occurred outside the territory covered by the Geneva Convention of May 15th, 1922, and that they were thus not within the Council's competence. In conformity with the statements made by the German Government it emphasised the fact that other cases quoted by the petitioners, some of which appeared to relate to events that occurred several years ago, had been investigated and decided by the President of the Mixed Commission; some of them had even been examined by the Council.

The rapporteur consequently felt that the Council should refrain from examining these cases and that, as regards the others—with the exception of the question regarding vocational and supplementary education, which formed the subject of a special petition—their importance would not justify direct examination by the Council. He proposed that they should in accordance with the Paris Agreement of April 6th, 1929, be referred to the German Government to be dealt with by the local procedure in force in Upper Silesia.

The Polish representative, M. Zaleski, did not question the fact that the Council was not competent to deal with cases arising outside the territory to which the German-Polish Convention regarding Upper Silesia applied. He felt that he must nevertheless emphasise the fact that two categories of minorities existed, the one protected, the other enjoying no international guarantees.

He recalled that the German Government had, in a note to the President of the Peace Conference, dated May 29th, 1919, stated that Germany had decided to treat the foreign minorities in its territory in conformity with the principles which it was asking might be applied to the German minorities outside the Reich.

Turning to the Polish minority in German Upper Silesia, where the system established under the Convention between Germany and Poland applied, he pointed out that the Council had unquestionably the right to discuss the subject. He felt that its principal task was to attenuate the divergencies and to give effective assistance to the minorities. While accepting the Japanese representative's report, M. Zaleski hoped that a state of normal relations between the German authorities and the Polish minority would inspire the latter with a feeling of confidence; without this there could never be established between the minority and the State that co-operation which, under the Treaties and the resolutions of the League Assembly and Council, was an obligation incumbent upon both state and minority alike.

M. von Rosenberg, the German representative, felt that the report before the Council made it clear that the Polish minority had gone far outside its rights in attempting to bring before the Council questions which were not within the latter's competence and in putting forward a large number of cases already settled.

With regard to the other cases submitted by the petitioners, he felt, as the report pointed out, that, even were the truth of these established, they were in any case of such trifling importance that there seemed to be no reason for the Council to concern itself with them directly.

He felt that the petitioners were doing an ill service to the League and to the minorities themselves in putting forward complaints which, as the German Government's observations served to show, were unjustified and ill-founded, and in reverting to past events upon which international authorities had already given decisions. He added that action such as that of the Polish petitioners was far from serving the cause of peaceful co-operation between the two groups of inhabitants, to the development of which the German and Prussian Governments attached no less importance than did the Council.

Petition of the Polish Catholic School Association.

This petition deals with the vocational and supplementary training of the Polish minority

in German Upper Silesia. The German Government had recognised that Article 115 of the Geneva Convention should be interpreted as affording the minorities the right to set up minority private vocational and extension schools. In authorising the establishment of the schools referred to in the petition the Prussian Government, however, announced that the pupils could not be exempted from obligation to attend the public extension schools until the private extension schools had proved by their teaching and organisation that their results really correspond to those of the State extension schools. The petitioners complained of the methods used in exercising the right, afforded under Article 115 of the Convention, of ensuring that the teaching was adequate, minority school pupils being forced to attend both the State and private school until such time as the authorities had come to some decision. The German Government had pointed out that the teaching and organisation of the schools in question was adequate.

The rapporteur, the Japanese representative, after explaining the position to the Council at its meeting of October 13th, said that in his opinion the question of principle raised should be settled by the Council, for it concerned both the Polish minority in German Upper Silesia and the German minority in the Voivodie of Silesia in Poland. He, therefore, asked the Council to authorise him to consult a Committee of three jurists to be appointed by the President of the Council as to whether the authorities had the right to demand under the provisions of the Geneva Convention that pupils of the minority private extension or vocational schools set up under Article 115 of the Convention should also attend State schools until the instruction given in the private schools had been declared adequate by the competent authorities.

The Council adopted the conclusions of the report, the President stating that he would appoint the Committee of three jurists in consultation with the rapporteur.

X.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The Special Committee—commonly known as the Committee of Nineteen—set up by the Extraordinary Assembly's resolution of March 11th met on October 1st, at the request of the Chinese Government, to consider the question of the extension of the six months period provided for in Article 12 of the Covenant. The Chinese Government had at the same time asked the Special Committee to take the steps required to prevent Japan from taking advantage of the delay to aggravate the situation.*

The President of the Special Committee, M. Hymans, first recalled the text of the resolution adopted by the Assembly on July 1st.† The Council of the League, he said, had decided to meet on November 14th, or at latest by the 21st, to consider the Lytton Commission's report. It would undoubtedly do everything possible to communicate this report to the Assembly without delay, together with any observations thereon. The Committee of Nineteen would then have to consider and draw up the proposals to be submitted to the Assembly with regard to the period of the extension referred to above. It was in these conditions possible to assure the Chinese representative

that, in conformity with the Assembly resolution, the extension would be for no longer than was strictly necessary. After an exchange of views between the President and M. Benes (Czechoslovakia) the Committee endorsed the President's point of view.

Turning to the second point in the Chinese Government's request, M. Hymans recalled the declaration which he had made to the Assembly on July 1st, when submitting the resolution voted. He added that the President of the Council, M. de Valera, had only a few days before expressed regret that, at a moment when the Council was awaiting the arrival of the Lytton Commission's Report, Japan had, in recognising the "Manchukuo Government" and in signing a treaty with it, taken measures which could not but prejudice the settlement of the dispute. All the members of the Committee would doubtless agree with him in sharing M. de Valera's sentiments. The two parties were formally bound not to aggravate the situation, and the postponements which had become necessary in no way freed them from their undertakings. The representatives of Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Spain supported the President's proposal, which was unanimously adopted.

It was agreed that the Minutes of the Committee's meeting would be communicated to the parties to the dispute.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 3, page 80.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 7, page 235.

As a result of the elections to the Council Mexico, under the Special Committee's resolution of March 11th, 1932, replaced Peru as a member of the Committee of Nineteen, and Czechoslovakia Yugoslavia. As Czechoslovakia was already a member of the Committee, the Assembly, on October 14th, proceeded to elect a further member.* Before the vote took place the President of the Assembly, M. Politis, announced that he had received from the Japanese delegation a letter stating that in view of its reservations when the resolution of March 11th was adopted, it would abstain from taking part in the Assembly's discussion.

As the result of a secret ballot, taken by roll-call, Turkey was elected to membership of the Committee of Nineteen.

Report of the Lytton Commission.

On October 2nd, the report drawn up by the Commission of Inquiry set up under the Council's resolution of December 10th, 1931, was issued at Geneva, Nanking and Tokio. A summary of this report is published as a supplement to this issue of the *Monthly Summary*.

At its meeting of October 15th, the Council decided to invite the members of the Commission of Inquiry to be present at Geneva when the report comes up before the Council.

2. DISPUTE BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY.

In reply to the telegram of September 30th from the Committee of Neutrals at Washington to the Committee set up by the Council to follow the development of the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay,† the President of the Council Committee, M. de Valera, in a telegram to the Committee of Neutrals, dated October 1st, explained that it seemed to him particularly desirable that "without in any way prejudicing the final solution of the dispute the two Governments should withdraw their forces to such a distance from one another as would do away with existing risk. The experience of the Council would indicate that the most effective method of bringing about this result would be the despatch of a commission of military officers chosen with a view to enabling them to proceed to the spot as quickly as possible, who would, acting in harmony with the military commanders in the fields on both sides, report on the measures taken to reduce the danger of local fighting. The Council Committee would welcome any further information which you

may be able to forward them on the progress of your efforts for securing acceptance of a basis for final arbitration of the conflict."

On October 3rd the Council Committee, in the presence of representatives of both Bolivia and Paraguay, informed the Council of the steps which it had taken; these were duly approved.

The President of the Committee of Neutrals replied to the Committee of the Council on October 13th. First recalling that the Committee of Neutrals had, on September 14th, already proposed, and the parties had accepted, the despatch by the neutrals of a commission of military officers to the spot as soon as the situation seemed appropriate, the telegram added:

"Therefore Neutrals still feel this question must be handled, as it has been in the past, with much patience, in order to avoid greater complications. Negotiations for termination of hostilities on satisfactory conditions of security to both are now proceeding satisfactorily, as are negotiations for securing acceptance of bases for final arbitration of conflict."

On October 15th, in the presence of the representatives of Bolivia and Paraguay, the President of the Council read this telegram to his colleagues. He added that the Council Committee fully appreciated the difficulties raised by the dispute and the necessity for circumspection in seeking a settlement. Hence, the Committee of the Council had endeavoured to maintain the closest possible contact with the Committee of Neutrals; moreover it appreciated the friendly efforts made by the countries neighbour to the two parties. As the Council was about to disperse the President proposed that the Committee of Three should be asked to follow the development of the question until its next meeting and, if necessary, to take, in the Council's name, any steps which it thought fit. The Council approved this suggestion and the despatch of a telegram to the President of the Committee of Neutrals. The Council said, in this telegram, that it was prepared to do everything in its power to promote the conclusion of negotiations for the cessation of hostilities and that the Council Committee would follow the course of events until the Council's next meeting, which would take place on November 21st at latest. The telegram expressed the hope that the Committee of Neutrals would continue to keep the Council Committee informed of any developments.

Addressing the representatives of Bolivia and Paraguay, the President of the Council stated that not only the Council, but all the Members of the League viewed with anxiety the

* See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 313.

† See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 259.

continuance of the serious situation in the Chaco district. It seemed inconceivable that the danger of an armed conflict should continue while the two Governments were declaring their determination to settle the question by peaceful means, in accordance with their obligations as Members of the League.

He hoped that the proposed military commission would be despatched without delay and that this measure would materially contribute to improving the situation.

The Bolivian representative announced that he would inform his Government of the President's communication. He was glad of the contact which had been established between the League and the Committee of Neutrals; his Government would endeavour to co-operate in any efforts undertaken.

3. REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FROM LIBERIA.

At its meeting of October 13th the Council had again on its agenda the request for assistance from the Liberian Government.

At this meeting it noted two reports submitted by the Polish delegate, one on Dr. MacKenzie's mission to the Kru Coast, and the other on the application of the plan of assistance drawn up by the Committee of the Council.

1. *Dr. MacKenzie's Mission to the Kru Coast.*

In May, 1932, the Council, after consultation with the Liberian Government, had decided to send a representative to the Kru Coast to pacify the tribes.

During last year certain Kru tribes took up arms against the Government. Later inter-tribal quarrels occurred. Some forty-four villages were burned and the fighting caused a considerable but unknown number of casualties. About eighteen tribes were involved in the trouble, which had its origin in land disputes, rebellions against unpopular chiefs, and the personal ambitions of individual chiefs.

When Dr. Mackenzie reached Monrovia on June 26th, 1932, all the tribes of the Kru Coast, fully armed, were engaged in hostilities with one or more of the other tribes or with the Government.

Four tribes, comprising some twelve thousand men, women, and children, had been driven into the bush and were in a state of advanced starvation. The position was further complicated by the fact that two of the Kru tribes had remained loyal to the Government.

This movement had been inspired by and was receiving support from certain political leaders among the civilised Krus in Monrovia,

and was being very closely watched by the Kru colonies in Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast, who either made efforts themselves to come and join in the fighting or to smuggle arms and ammunition to the dissident tribes.

Dr. Mackenzie spent two months on the Kru Coast and achieved certain satisfactory results. All fighting was stopped. Of the four tribes driven into the bush, two returned to their lands; the two others are to remain in the bush for a period of one year, under conditions which they accepted. All the tribes on the Kru Coast, both friendly and hostile, are now completely disarmed, while all the hostile tribes were personally visited by the Council representative, who was thus able to deal with the special problems of each.

Outstanding land disputes between the tribes of the Kru Coast were dealt with in detail. Peace ceremonies according to the native custom were carried out in each case, involving some twenty tribes on the Kru Coast, while the authority of the Paramount Chiefs was restored.

In his report to the Council Dr. Mackenzie explained that he had throughout the whole of his mission been assisted by the Liberian Government representative (the Honourable F. A. K. Russell), who had worked in the closest harmony with him, thus enabling him to achieve the results accomplished. He added that the measures adopted were provisional and would apply for one year, pending the setting up of a government land commission and the establishment of permanent peace.

The rapporteur to the Council, M. Zaleski (Poland), congratulated Dr. Mackenzie on the excellent work which he had carried out in very difficult conditions and upon his courage, tact, and energy. He expressed his gratitude to the United Kingdom Government, which had afforded the League representative special facilities. He drew the Council's attention to the provisional nature of the agreements and to the necessity of granting Liberia the assistance requested without delay, and of concluding the financial negotiations necessary to that end.

Lord Cecil, as President of the Committee of the Council which had dealt with the plan of assistance to Liberia, and Mr. Grimes, the representative of the Liberian Government, thanked Dr. Mackenzie for the remarkable work which he had carried out.

Mr. Grimes was, moreover, glad to feel that Dr. Mackenzie's visit had completely dispelled the malicious accusations that the expedition to Sassstown, imposed upon the Republic by the necessity of maintaining peace, was due to a vindictive desire to take reprisals against

witnesses who had testified before one or other of the Commissions of Inquiry sent to Liberia.

2. *Plan of Assistance Drawn up by the Committee of the Council.*

The report of the Special Committee which the Council had considered at its May session* provided for the opening at the earliest possible moment of negotiations between the Liberian Government, the Finance Corporation of America, and the Firestone Plantations Company. These negotiations were expected to take place in November.

The rapporteur to the Council, M. Zaleski, expressed his regret at this delay; he hoped that there would be no cause for a fresh adjournment.

Mr. Grimes (Liberia) recalled that the Committee's plan had been accepted by his Government, subject to a satisfactory conclusion of the financial negotiations to be undertaken with the Firestone Plantations Company and the Finance Corporation.

Mr. Grimes assured the Council that, should these negotiations be successful, and should the plan enter into force, Liberia would faithfully fulfil the proposed undertakings. He added that he hoped the Council would, in its selection of the experts to be sent to Liberia, be careful to choose persons free from racial prejudice and otherwise psychologically fitted to undertake, in a spirit of fair play, impartiality and justice, the duties that would devolve upon them.

He was glad that the United States Government had approved the general principles of the plan and had submitted it to the financial groups concerned. He thanked the Committee of the Council for its untiring efforts to sift the mass of erroneous statements with which it had had to deal.

He then explained his country's financial situation, referring, in particular, to the difficulties involved in the service of the loan contracted with the Finance Corporation of America and the consequences of the concession granted to the Firestone Company. He stated that the service of this loan was absorbing an increasing proportion of the Republic's revenues; 20 per cent. in 1928, 26 per cent. in 1929, 32 per cent. in 1930, 54 per cent. in 1931. The 1932 figures were not yet available. To meet these enormous charges the Liberian Government had been forced to reduce the salaries of its officials in very considerable proportions.

He alluded to the fear expressed by the United States representative at the Committee of the Council with regard to any delay in the execution of the plan of assistance and deplored the fact that a further delay had now been demanded by the representatives of the financial groups concerned. He hoped that a settlement satisfactory to the parties concerned might be achieved.

In reply to Mr. Grimes, M. Zaleski recalled that the United States representative on the Council Committee had stated that his Government had forwarded the text of the plan of assistance drawn up by the Committee to the Finance Corporation, and that he had also drawn his Government's attention to the Committee's wish that the negotiations should begin as early as possible.

The Council requested the Committee to continue its work and to submit a report on the progress of the negotiations. In view and the urgent nature of the question it decided to include it on the agenda of its forthcoming extraordinary session.

XI.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

I. PROTECTION AND WELFARE OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

The League's activities in the sphere of child welfare and the suppression of the traffic in women and children were discussed by the Fifth Committee of the Assembly.

Child Welfare.†

The Assembly approved the work done by the Child Welfare Committee, which had mainly dealt with the education of blind children, with juvenile courts, and with illegitimate children.

* See Monthly Summary, 1932, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 164.

† See Assembly resolution; Annex, page 313.

It further adopted two resolutions, one submitted by the Roumanian and the other by the Turkish delegation. The first proposed the inclusion in the Child Welfare Committee's programme of the question of the offence of deserting the family; the second proposed inviting the States Members of the League to redouble their efforts to assist those children suffering most from the effects of the economic crisis.

Traffic in Women and Children.‡

The problems to do with the traffic have been during the past ten years the subject of various

‡ See Assembly resolution; Annex, page 313.

inquiries, the most important of which covered the nature and extent of the traffic in Europe, America, and certain parts of northern Africa. More lately an inquiry was undertaken into the traffic in the East, the results of which will shortly be published.

The Assembly noted with satisfaction that during the ten years in question an increasing number of countries had abolished the system of licensed houses and the regulation of prostitution. During the past year Egypt, Mexico, and the Soudan had adhered to the 1921 Convention, while the United Kingdom had deposited the instruments of ratification of the three Conventions of 1904, 1910, and 1921, on behalf of Palestine and of several Crown Colonies and Protectorates. The Persian delegate, too, had announced that his Government had just ratified the 1921 Convention, and the delegate of the Irish Free State that his Government would shortly ratify it. At present fourteen States Members of the League are not parties to the Conventions on the traffic, and of those who have signed them four have not yet ratified.

* * *

The Fifth Committee also dealt with the proposed reorganisation of the Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People which, as will be remembered, is composed of the Traffic in Women and Child Welfare Committees. Certain delegations were in favour of the principal of rotation in the representation of the States.

The Fifth Committee felt that the Commission should retain the co-operation of the private organisations and seek yet more effective collaboration with experts versed in the various questions on its agenda.

The Indian delegate felt that the Commission would be well advised to co-opt women experts from India and other oriental countries.

2. PENAL AND PENITENTIARY QUESTIONS.*

The Assembly was glad to note that the *International Prison Commission* had taken action on its resolution of last year† requesting it to consider afresh the standard rules for the treatment of prisoners in the light of the observations received by the League Secretariat; it was also glad to learn that the Commission would be in a position to forward its conclusions during 1933.

The Assembly, which had last year decided to consult certain international organisations

dealing with penal and penitentiary problems on an international scale, and to ask them in what way the League could co-operate in the work for progressive unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and repression of crime, noted the reply received from these various organisations as a result of their meeting held at Geneva in May, 1932.

It decided, however, not to discuss the substance of the problem in order to give the Governments time to study this reply.

3. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

(a) *Meeting of the Permanent Central Opium Board.*

The Permanent Central Opium Board held its fourteenth session at Geneva from October 17th to 22nd, Mr. Lyall (British) presiding.

Its agenda included the consideration of a Progress Report submitted by the Secretary of the Board, the question of the possible use of the commercial drug trade statistics, more particularly as regards certain Latin-American countries from which the Board received incomplete statistics, the definition of the term "Government purposes" in the statistics, and consideration of the memorandum submitted by Dr. Anselmino (German) regarding certain gaps in the annual returns of seizures of drugs received by the Board.

The report emphasised the fact that the Persian Government had deposited the instrument of ratification of the Convention for the limitation of manufacture of narcotic drugs and that at the time of the last Assembly eighteen Governments had manifested their intention of ratifying or adhering to this Convention in time to permit of its entry into force. It dealt with the import and export statistics for the second quarter of 1932, and reviewed the work of the Fifth Committee of the Assembly in so far as the Board's activities were concerned. Finally it contained a statement of the ratifications and accessions to the 1925 and 1931 Conventions.

The Board considered the commercial drug trade statistics for the Latin-American countries submitted by Dr. Anselmino. The document which he presented pointed out that a certain number of these countries sent the Committee either no information or irregular information on their imports and exports of narcotic drugs. It dealt, therefore, with the question whether the commercial statistics regarding the movements of narcotic drugs in Colombia and Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and the Argentine could be used to fill up these gaps.

* See Assembly Resolution: Annex, page 314.

† See Monthly Summary, 1931, Vol. XI., No. 9, page 254.

Dr. Anselmino also reported on certain further gaps existing in the statistics received by the Board concerning the seizures of drugs. Under the 1925 Convention the Board is only entitled to receive returns of seizures effected on account of illicit import or export. The Board therefore considered the possibility of applying also for the figures of quantities seized in the interior of a country but coming from another country.

Dr. Anselmino proposed that the Board should consider whether it would not be well to indicate in the statements regarding seizures that the term "confiscated upon illicit import" should be interpreted in its broadest sense.

The Board held consultations with M. Immelen, German Consul-General at Geneva, representing the German Government, regarding the publication by the Board of the statistics supplied by the contracting parties to the 1925 Opium Convention. It will be remembered that the German Government had expressed concern as to the possible injury which, in its opinion, such publication might bring to Germany's legitimate drug trade, and had asked the Central Board to introduce certain changes in the manner in which these statistics are made public. The question had been referred to the Council at its sixty-eighth session.*

The Board, though not entirely convinced that Germany's legitimate trade had been appreciably affected as a result of the publication of these statistics nevertheless agreed in future only to publish a single unified table for the manufacture, export, consumption, stocks, etc., of the three following substances: eucodal, dicodide, and dilauidide.

The following took part in the Board's work: M. Gallavresi (Italian), Dr. Anselmino (German), M. Lucide Agel (French), Sir Atul Chatterjee (Indian), Mr. May (American), M. Miyajima (Japanese), and M. Militchevitch (Yugoslav).

(b) *Drafting of a Model Administrative Code.*

The Sub-Committee set up by the Opium Advisory Committee to prepare a model administrative code for purposes of the application of the 1931 Convention for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs met at Geneva from October 3rd to 14th.

The draft code drawn up by the Sub-Committee during this session contains various suggestions of a legal, administrative, and

practical nature intended to facilitate the working of the Convention and to ensure that its application be as uniform as possible. The value of the code is enhanced by the fact that the persons who have contributed to its drafting possess extensive knowledge of the various legislations on narcotic drugs and of the methods of supervision of the drug traffic. Thus the draft code is the result of the varied experience of more than one country.

The draft code contains suggestions on the connotation to be given in national legislations to the terms "narcotic drugs," "reserve stocks," and "Government stocks." It deals also with methods for establishing the annual estimates which form the basis of the plan for the limitation of manufacture and with the provisions to be made in order to ensure the effective limitation of actual manufacture. Finally, it contains practical suggestions regarding the application of the measures of supervision provided for in the Convention.

This draft code, which is intended to serve as a guide to the Governments in drawing up their legislation and regulations for the application and administering of the Convention will be submitted to the Council for its approval.

The following took part in the Sub-Committee's work: M. Bourgois (France), Chairman, M. Casares (Spain), M. van Wettum (Netherlands), Dr. Carrière (Switzerland), Sir Malcolm Delevingne (United Kingdom), M. Ferri (Italy), M. Kusama (Japan), and Mr. Stuart T. Fuller (United States of America).

Dr. Kahler (Germany) was unable to follow the Sub-Committee's work.

The Permanent Central Opium Board was represented by Mr. Herbert May and Dr. Anselmino, in an advisory capacity.

4. SLAVERY.†

The Assembly directed the attention of the States Members of the League and the States parties to the 1926 Convention to the opinions and suggestions contained in the report of the Committee of Experts on Slavery, forwarded to the Assembly by the Council.‡

When discussing the subject of slavery the Sixth Committee unanimously proposed the constitution of an advisory committee of experts responsible for:

(1) Studying and examining the documents supplied or transmitted by Governments to the Secretariat;

† See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 314.

* See Monthly Summary. Vol. XII., Nos. 8 and 9, page 264.

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 172.

(2) Studying on the basis of such documents and of the special knowledge of its members the facts and institutions mentioned in Article 1 of the 1926 Slavery Convention;

(3) Studying the means of gradually abolishing these institutions or customs;

(4) Examining the question of financial assistance to be afforded by the League to countries applying for this for purposes of solving problems connected with the abolition of slavery.

In carrying out its duties this Committee was to refrain from consulting organisations or persons on facts concerning slavery. Organisations or persons should send their complaints or observations through the intermediary of their respective Governments. Any communication regarding a given country addressed to the Committee by the Government of another State would be forwarded by the Council to the Government concerned for its observations.

The Committee would not be competent to hear depositions.

In agreeing to the constitution of this Committee, the Governments, parties to the Slavery Convention of 1926, would not assume any obligation modifying the undertakings they had entered into in virtue of that Convention.

The Assembly approved the constitution of this Advisory Committee and instructed the Secretary-General to include the necessary credits for that purpose in the 1934 draft budget.

5. ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES.

The Assembly noted with satisfaction the report of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for Refugees.*

Lord Cecil (United Kingdom), the Sixth Committee's rapporteur on this subject, pointed out that there were three ways of dealing with the refugee problem: to assist the refugees to return to their own country, to absorb them into the life of the country of residence, or to help them in the country in which they have temporarily settled with a view to achieving a lasting settlement in some part of the globe.

The report states that while, as a result of the crisis, less funds are available, the number of refugees requiring assistance has materially increased. In many countries the refugees have been the first to lose employment and, in general, do not benefit by unemployment relief. There are at the present time more than a

million refugees not assimilated to the population of the country in which they live, of whom some 43,000 are too old, too young, or too ill to work, and a further 150,000 without means of gaining their livelihood. Certain Governments, too, are expelling refugees on trivial charges even before neighbouring States had consented to receive them.

The Assembly accordingly requested the Governments not to expel any refugee who had not procured authorisation to enter a neighbouring country.

During the period April 1st, 1931, to June 30th, 1932, the Nansen Office has provided 14,292 refugees with dwellings, land or work. Of these about 4,000 Armenians in Syria, more than 6,000 Armenians, transferred from Greece to Soviet Armenia, 772 Lutheran and Mennonite refugees from Russia, transferred from Manchuria in the midst of the fighting to South America, and more than three thousand individuals of various nationalities. The Office had, further, given direct assistance to 59,000 other refugees.

The Assembly requested the Office to consider the possibility of transferring to the Armenian Republic (Erivan) a fresh contingent of 20,000 Armenian refugees who might express the desire to settle there. To this end it invited the Governments to afford the Office financial assistance earlier promised to Dr. Nansen, and the national committees appointed by the Governments to renew their efforts to collect funds for the execution of the Erivan Settlement Scheme. With reference to the proposed settlement in agricultural or urban areas in Syria of Armenians still remaining in the camps of Alexandretta, Aleppo, and Beyrouth, the Assembly expressed the hope that a satisfactory agreement with the Mandatory Power might shortly be reached regarding future assistance to refugees in that country.

It also asked the Office to make every effort to alleviate the unfortunate situation of the 20,000 refugees in China rendered destitute by the recent floods.

With a view to placing more adequate funds at the disposal of the Office, the Assembly recommended the general application of the Nansen Stamp System and the setting up of national committees for the Nansen Memorial Fund. It also expressed the hope that the various private organisations interested in refugee work would consent to co-operate with the Office, and requested the latter shortly to submit a report on this subject to the Council.

* See Assembly resolution: Annex, page 315.

(6) INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.*

Entry into Force of the Convention.

Following on the accession by Persia on September 28th last to the Geneva Convention of July 12th, 1929, establishing an International Relief Union for peoples overtaken by disaster, which thus raised the number of Contracting Parties to twenty-seven, the States Members of the League of Nations and the States non-Members to whom this Convention was open for signature, have been informed by the Secretary-General that the conditions required for its entry into force are now fulfilled and that it will become effective on December 27th, 1932.

The International Relief Union, of which the Italian Senator Ciralo was the initiator, is a union constituted between States and based upon a spirit of international solidarity. Its object is to relieve populations stricken by unforeseen calamities by means of the immediate despatch of assistance, by the co-ordination of the efforts of all voluntary organisations, and by the encouragement of studies and preventive measures. Its resources consist of an initial fund (constituted by the signatory States, each of which contributes 700 Swiss francs in respect of each unit in its quota of the League budget), of Government voluntary grants, funds collected by public subscription, and various donations.

The entry into force of the Convention of July 12th, 1927, was subjected to two con-

ditions: it was to have received at least twelve signatures or accessions, and the combined contributions were to amount to six hundred shares.

The first condition was fulfilled some time ago; Persia's accession has fulfilled the second.

At present the following countries are Members of the International Relief Union, Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Luxemburg, Monaco, Persia, Poland, Roumania, San Marino, Turkey, Venezuela, Sudan, Switzerland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia.

The Committee of the International Relief Union met on October 26th under the chairmanship of Dr. Külz, former Finance Minister of the Reich, to consider the measures to be taken upon the entry into force of the Convention of July 12th, 1927.

The Committee drew the attention of the Council of the League to the convening of the first meeting of the General Council of the International Relief Union and made certain suggestions as to the agenda for this meeting. It also decided to forward to it, as a basis for discussion, draft regulations for the General Council and Executive Committee.†

At this meeting were present, besides the Chairman, M. Ciralo (Italy) and M. François (Belgium), representatives of the International Red Cross Committee and the League of Red Cross Societies.

XII.—BUDGETARY AND INTERNAL ORGANISATION QUESTIONS.

(a) THE LEAGUE'S BUDGET.

The budget of the League drawn up for the year 1933 amounts to 33,429,132 frs. as opposed to 33,687,994 frs. in 1932.

The budget as originally drafted totalled 32,849,875 frs. but following on the addition of certain supplementary credits—in particular a credit of 436,000 frs. for the World Monetary and Economic Conference—it was increased to 33,429,132 frs.; this figure shows a reduction of more than two hundred thousand francs on that of last year's budget.

The proposed expenditure is distributed as follows:—

	Swiss Francs
1. Secretariat and special Organisations of the League ..	17,322,459
2. International Labour Organisation	8,851,972
3. Permanent Court of International Justice	2,660,196

* See Monthly Summary, 1927, Vol. VII., No. 7, page 236.

	Swiss Francs
4. Nansen International Refugee Office	297,763
5. Buildings at Geneva	2,934,659
6. Pensions	1,829,906
7. Advance account	432,177
Total ..	33,429,132
* * *	

† The General Council of the Union, which is a deliberative and constitutional body and deals with all the Union's affairs, includes delegates from all the Members—one delegate per Member. Any Member can be represented by its national Red Cross Society or by an appropriate national organisation.

The General Council meets every two years at the seat of the Union at Geneva.

The Executive Committee consists of seven Members appointed by the General Council for a period of two years. It also includes two representatives of the International Red Cross Organisation in an advisory capacity.

It meets at least once yearly at the seat of the Union. It administers the Union's funds and represents it in its dealings with the League of Nations, the Governments, and the organisations referred to in the Convention. In the case of a disaster it has power to take action on behalf of the Union and to organised relief.

Economy was the main note in this year's discussions in the Fourth Committee. The long discussion which preceded consideration of the budget dealt in particular with the rationalisation of the various organs of the League, the higher officials, the salaries of officials, and contributions in arrear.*

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS IN ARREAR.

During the general discussion in the Fourth Committee, various speakers drew attention, with reference to the League's present financial situation, to the contributions in arrear for 1932.

The Secretary-General stated that on September 19th the proportion of contributions received for the current year amounted to 58·83 per cent. or 64·14 per cent. if contributions in arrear already received were added to this figure; the figure in question showed an 8 per cent. reduction on that for the corresponding period of last year. He added that as the Secretariat expenditure on that date represented only 47·5 per cent. of the budget there was a balance in hand of 3,750,000 frs. He explained that the considerable extent of the economies effected was due to the fact that the estimates for the Disarmament Conference had been drawn up on the assumption that a certain number of Committees would sit simultaneously; this would have considerably increased the cost.

The question of contributions in arrear was studied by a special sub-committee which submitted a confidential report to the Committee. Upon receiving this report, the Committee, after noting with regret that a certain number of States had not fulfilled their financial obligations to the League, asked the Assembly to make an appeal to all the States Members to pay up their contributions in arrear without delay.

(c) ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES.

On the proposal of the Committee for the Allocation of Expenses, the Fourth Committee fixed Turkey's contribution at ten units and that of Iraq at three. It decided, however, in the case of Turkey, that this decision would only apply to the year 1933, and that the question should be examined afresh next year.

Certain delegates further pointed out that the scale for the allocation of expenses was no longer fitted to the present situation and asked that other criteria should be used when establishing the quotas of States.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Allocation of Expenses recalled that in any case the scale in force was applicable to the financial years 1933 and 1934, and that the new scale under review was not due to be submitted until the 1934 Assembly.

(d) RATIONALISATION OF THE VARIOUS ORGANS OF THE LEAGUE.

One of the best means of effecting economies seemed to be the rationalisation and concentration of various services and activities of the League.

The Fourth Committee also recommended the Assembly to ask the Supervisory Commission to proceed during the forthcoming year to a detailed examination of possible economies along these lines, subject to the reservation that the essential work of the League should in no way be impaired. Any posts proved by this examination to be superfluous might be abolished by the Secretary-General before the next ordinary session of the Assembly. If more extensive reorganisation were to be undertaken, the Secretary-General must first submit the question to the Council for approval. Lastly, in cases where existing contracts expired or where posts fell vacant for some other reason, the Secretary-General was to consider the possibility of refraining from making any fresh appointment. These provisions should not, however, mean that nationals of States at present not represented on the staff of the Secretariat and Labour Office should be prevented from obtaining posts.

The Assembly further requested the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, which had already undertaken studies on the subject of rationalisation and taken certain steps to this effect, to assist the Supervisory Commission when it came to deal with the International Labour Office and its co-operation with the Secretariat.

(e) HIGHER OFFICIALS.

In view of the resignation of the Secretary-General, Sir Eric Drummond, the Fourth Committee studied the whole question of the higher officials of the Secretariat—in abeyance since 1930. It also drafted a public declaration to be made by League officials upon assuming office. After affirming the principle that the holders of the higher posts in the Secretariat, including the Secretary-General, ought, like all League officials, to be chosen for their abilities, their personal qualifications, and the contribution they could make to the performance of the League's task, the Fourth Committee, to

* See Assembly resolutions: Annex, page 316.

facilitate the application of this principle and in order to give the Members of the League not permanently represented on the Council a larger share in the responsibilities devolving on the principal officers of the Secretariat, proposed to the Assembly that it should create a second post of Deputy-Secretary-General. This would make it possible to assign one of these posts to a national of a State not permanently represented on the Council, in the event of the Secretary-General having been chosen from among the nationals of Members permanently represented there.

The Committee also felt that when making appointments to the higher posts of the Secretariat, the main geographical divisions should be borne in mind.

This point settled, the Committee decided to retain three posts of under-Secretary-General, and to consider the legal adviser, the character of whose functions was non-political, as holding the rank of an Under-Secretary-General.

It settled that the Secretary-General should be appointed for ten, the Deputy-Secretaries-General for eight, and the Under-Secretaries-General for seven years.*

Finally, giving effect to the previous wishes of the Assembly that a more equitable distribution of nationalities be effected, it agreed that not more than two nationals of any one Member of the League should hold the higher posts in the Secretariat, including those of Directors, and that this principle should be carried into effect at the earliest possible moment, existing contracts remaining unaffected.

(f) APPOINTMENT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

The Council, at its meeting of October 7th, unanimously appointed M. Joseph Avenol, Deputy Secretary-General of the League of Nations, to succeed Sir Eric Drummond when the latter resigns on June 30th next. This appointment will be submitted for approval to the forthcoming Extraordinary Assembly,

(g) SALARIES OF OFFICIALS.

The question of salaries of officials was the subject of controversy. Certain delegations expressed the opinion that these were too high, in view of the reduced cost of living and the salary reductions in almost all national administrations. Other delegations pointed out that

the cost of living at Geneva was still very high, and that they considered the present salaries justified, in view of various other considerations (recruiting of competent staff, expatriation, difficulties regarding promotion). The Supervisory Commission was against tampering with a system finally adopted by the 1930 Assembly and which the Fourth Committee had refused to reconsider last year.

A proposal was submitted to the Fourth Committee that a unanimous appeal should be made to the officials asking them to make a spontaneous offer to reduce their salaries. This proposal was not adopted, but during the discussion delegates raised the question as to whether the Assembly had or had not the right unilaterally to amend the contracts of its officials.

Consideration of this point was referred to a Committee of five jurists which unanimously declared that the Assembly had not the right unilaterally to reduce salaries unless expressly afforded this right by a clause in the contracts.

On the other hand, where future contracts were concerned, the Fourth Committee decided to operate from October 15th, 1932, as an experimental measure for two years a 10 per cent. reduction in the present scale of salaries. It further recommended the inclusion in all new contracts of a clause stipulating that the Assembly had the right unilaterally to modify the salaries paid. The Committee felt that exemption from this future reduction should be afforded to temporary staff holding short-term contracts, whose pay had already been considerably reduced, as well as to personnel whose annual emoluments totalled 6,500 francs or under.

(h) ROTATION IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUPERVISORY COMMISSION.

The Fourth Committee re-elected for a period ending on December 31st, 1935, M. Parra-Perez as a regular member and M. Georges de Ottlik and M. de Modzelewski as substitute members of the Supervisory Commission.

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL.

The Council renewed for a further period of three years the mandates of M. Devèze and M. de Tomcsanyi, judge and deputy judge on the Administrative Tribunal of the League.

(j) RESIGNATION OF M. SUVICH.

M. Suvich, whose resignation from the Financial Committee is referred to elsewhere,

* The appointment of the Secretary-General might be renewed for three, those of the Deputy-Secretaries-General for five, and those of the Under-Secretaries-General for a further single period of seven years.

was also a member of the Investments Committee of the Pensions Fund and Provident Fund of the League; as he has likewise resigned from this Committee, M. de Chalendar, a former

member of the Financial Committee and present Director-General of the *Compagnie française d'Assurance sur la Vie*, has been appointed to succeed him.

XIII.—ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PRINCIPAL VOLUMES ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

CATALOGUED IN THE LIBRARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

GENERAL AND POLITICAL

(including Disarmament and Minorities).

AVRAMOFF, D.

Le Président du Conseil de la Société des Nations, Bordeaux, Delmas, 1932.

Study of the rôle and powers of the President of the League Council. Review of the activities of the Presidents, and more particularly of M. Briand's rôle in this capacity.

FISCHER WILLIAMS, SIR J.

La Convention pour l'assistance financière aux Etats victimes d'aggression. Dans Académie de droit international, Recueil des Cours, IV., 1930. Pp. 81-174.

After studying the origin and text of the Convention for financial assistance the author analyses the fundamental changes introduced by this Convention into the previous conception of the individual in international law and the classic doctrine of neutrality, and analyses the Convention as a basis for sanctions.

FLEMING, D. F.

The United States and the League of Nations, 1918-1920. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932. 559 pp.

American public opinion and the Senate's attitude towards the ratification of the Covenant.

GUGGENHEIM, P.

Der Völkerbund. Leipsig, B. G. Teubner, 1932. 281 pp.

Describes in detail the organs and duties of the League (commentary on the various Articles of the Covenant); analyses the political problems at the basis of its activities. This work contains *inter alia* chapters on regionalism in the Covenant, the revision of the Covenant, the League's sphere of action, the problem of security, the settlement of disputes, disarmament, the revision of the treaties, international co-operation in the economic and financial sphere and in the sphere of communications, mandates, minorities.

HUDSON, M. C.

Progress in international organisation. Stanford, University Press, 1932. 162 pp.

Survey of the progress of international organisation, containing more particularly short studies on the League of Nations, the International Labour Office, and the Permanent Court of International Justice.

LES INCIDENTS sino-japonais en Mandchourie. Paris, Editions internationales, 1932. 167 pp.

Action of the League of Nations in the Sino-Japanese dispute.

KUNSTENAAR, J.

Der Finanzhaushalt des Völkerbundes mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ausgabenpolitik. Zurich, H. A. Cutzwiller, 1932. 119 pp.

After an analysis of the supervision over League expenditure the author studies the expenditure on the various branches of work and also the system of contributions.

LADAS, S. P.

The exchange of minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey. New York, Macmillan Company, 1932. 849 pp.

The author studies the exchange of minorities between Greece and Bulgaria, the exchange of Greek and Turkish populations, and the question of the settlement of Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish refugees and emigrants.

LEVY, R.

Intellectuels, unissez-vous! Paris, M. Rivière, 1931. 237 pp.

Statement of the various activities of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation, followed by a number of conversations with eminent intellectuals.

MALEXIEUX DU HAMEL, A.D.

Le Pape et la Société des Nations. Paris, A. Mechlinck, 1932. 114 pp.

After studying the influence of the Lateran agreements on the international situation and the attitude of Catholic circles towards

the League of Nations, the author studies the advantages and drawbacks from the League's standpoint of the admission of the Holy See.

STONE, J.

International guarantees of minority rights
London, H. Milford, 1932. 280 pp.

After an account of the protection of minorities in the nineteenth century and a comparison with the League system of protection, the author studies the minorities procedure (Secretariat, Committee of the Council, Council).

WOU, P.

Histoire diplomatique de la Chine depuis
1919. Paris, Rousseau, 1932. 334 pp.

Deals in one chapter with China's activities in the League of Nations in regard to the revision of treaties.

LEGAL.

COLANERI, A.

De la condition des "sans patrie." Paris,
Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence,
1932. 229 pp.

Studies also the League's action in regard to Statelessness.

COLLETTE, J.

Les principes de droit des gens dans la
jurisprudence de la Cour Permanente de
Justice Internationale. Paris, Berger-Levrault
1931. 207 pp.

Among the principles of international law examined in the light of the legal practice of the Permanent Court appear the sovereignty of the State, the nationality of individuals and juridical persons, international obligations, changes in sovereignty and their consequences, and various questions regarding the sea and international waterways.

CUTEN, A.

La notion de guerre permise. Paris, A.
Mechelinck, 1931. 215 pp.

The Covenant of the League of Nations and war.

MARESH, C.

La codification du droit international. Paris,
Pedone, 1932. 180 pp.

The author studies the doctrine and work of the scientific associations in this domain, the codification of international law in America, the questions which have formed the subject of regulations in Europe, the first Codification Conference, and problems of the future.

SPITZ, R.

La formation du Pacte de la Société des
Nations—les sources et les influences. Paris,
Imprimerie Albes Frères, 1932. 96 pp.

The various sources of the Covenant and their incorporation in the Covenant.

WIGNIOLLE, A.

La Société des Nations et la révision des
traités. Paris, Rousseau & Cie, 1932. 324 pp.

The position of Article 19 of the Covenant in international law and its application in the policy of the League of Nations.

ECONOMIC.

KOSZUL, J. P.

La restauration financière de la Bulgarie
(1922-1931). Paris, F. Alcan, 1932. 468 pp.

Deals *inter alia* with the League's activities in regard to Bulgarian financial reconstruction, the settlement of refugees, the Protocol signed at Geneva on March 10th, 1928, etc.

MANDATES.

BASTET, J.

Le travail forcé et l'Organisation inter-
nationale (S.d.N. et B.I.T.). Paris, Librairie
générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1932.
189 pp.

Forced labour as dealt with by the Man-
dates Commission and the I.L.O.

SAGHIR, A.

Le sionisme et le mandat anglais en Palestine.
Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1932.
240 pp.

The Jewish national home and the obligations of the Mandatory Power.

XIV.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

November 21st.—Continuation of the sixty-
ninth session of the Council, Geneva.

November 21st.—Supervisory Commission,
Geneva.

November 21st.—General Commission of the
Conference for the Reduction and Limita-
tion of Armaments, Geneva.

December 5th.—Committee of Inquiry on

Traffic in Women and Children in the
East, Geneva.

December 5th.—Committee appointed to con-
sider the present system of Election to the
Council, Geneva.

At the moment of going to press no date has
been fixed for the meeting of the Extraordinary
Session of the Assembly.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE COURT.

The twenty-sixth (extraordinary) session of the Court began on October 14th.

The Court was composed as follows :

Mm. Adatci, President (Japan); Guerrero, Vice-President (Salvador); Baron Rolin Jaequemyns (Belgium); Count Rostworoski (Poland); Mm. Fromageot (France); M. Anzilotti (Italy); Urrutia (Colombia); Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain); Mm. Schücking (Germany); Negulesco (Roumania); Jonkheer van Eysinga (Netherlands).

Messrs. Kellogg (U.S.A.); de Bustamante (Cuba); Altamira (Spain); and Wang (China) were unable to attend for reasons of health.

The Court's general list then included the following seven cases :

The case concerning the legal status of certain parts of Eastern Greenland (Denmark and Norway); the case concerning the territorial waters between the Castellorizo and Anatolia (Italy and Turkey); the case relating to the interpretation of the Convention of 1919 concerning the Employment of Women during the Night (Advisory Opinion); the case concerning the Prince of Pless Administration (Germany and Poland); the Appeal of the Czechoslovak Government against two judgments given on December 21st, 1931, by the Hungaro-Czechoslovak Mixed Arbitral Tribunal (Czechoslovakia-Hungary); the case concerning the south-eastern territory of Greenland (Norway and Denmark) the appeal of the Czechoslovak Government against a judgment given on April 13th, 1932, by the Hungaro-Czechoslovak Mixed Arbitral Tribunal (Czechoslovakia-Hungary).

The special list of the twenty-sixth session originally included only the two cases ready for hearing on October 14th: the case relating to the Convention of 1919 concerning the Employment of Women during the Night, and the Eastern Greenland case; a plea for the jurisdiction of the Court filed by the Polish Government in the Prince of Pless case having become ready for hearing on October 31st, it was automatically included in the list under Article 27 of the Rules.

2. INTERPRETATION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1919 CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN DURING THE NIGHT.

By an order made on September 6th, 1932, the President of the Court fixed September 20th

as the last date for the presentation of a second written statement by the States or Organisations which had filed a first statement. This time-limit also applied to written statements filed by States and Organisations which had been notified of the Request but which had not filed a statement within the first time-limit fixed for the purpose.

On September 21st the German Government handed in a written statement. Although this document was filed one day late, the President, having regard to the circumstances, decided, under paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 33 of the Rules of Court, that the proceeding should be considered as valid.

On October 14th, the opening date of the session, the Court held two public sittings for the hearing of the representatives of the States and Organisations interested in this case. The States and Organisations represented were :

The German Government (Count Julius de Zech Burkersroda, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Agent, and M. Johannes Feig, *Geheimer Regierungsrat*, Head of Division in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Assistant Agent); the Government of Great Britain (Sir Bertram Okeden Bircham, M.C., Solicitor to the Ministry of Labour, Agent, Mr. Ernest Hamilton Richards, Solicitor, Chief Clerk, Solicitor's Department, Ministry of Labour, Assistant Agent, and Mr. Alexander Pandelli Fachiri, Barrister-at-Law, Counsel); The International Labour Organisation (Mr. Phelan, Head of the Diplomatic Division of the International Labour Office, and M. Morellet Legal Adviser to the International Labour Office); The International Confederation of Christian Trades Unions (the Secretary-General, M. Serrarens); the International Federation of Trade Unions (the Secretary-General, M. Schevenels).

Mr. Phelan spoke on behalf of the International Labour Organisation; Mr. Fachiri, on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mr. Feig, on behalf of the German Government, M. Serrarens, on behalf of the International Confederation of Christian Trades Unions, and, lastly, M. Schevenels, on behalf of the International Federation of Trades Unions.

3. THE PRINCE OF PLESS ADMINISTRATION.

At the request of the Polish Government, the President of the Court had, on September 5th, 1932, made an order extending the time-limits

* This chapter has been compiled on the basis of material supplied by the Registry of the Court.

for the submission of the documents of the written proceedings which had not yet been filed. The new time-limits were as follows :—

For the Polish Government's Counter-case : October 10th, 1932 ;

For the German Government's Reply : November 10th, 1932 ;

For the Polish Government's Rejoinder : December 10th, 1932.

On October 8th the Polish Government, through its Agent before the Court, filed a preliminary objection and preliminary counter-case. The preliminary objection asks the Court to declare the German Government's application inadmissible.

By an order made on October 10th, the President of the Court fixed October 31st as the last date on which the German Government might submit a written statement of its observations and conclusions in regard to the Polish Government's objection.

A hearing on the same subject was fixed for November 4th, 1932.

4. CASES CONCERNING CERTAIN JUDGMENTS DELIVERED BY THE HUNGARY-CZECHOSLOVAK MIXED ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL.

On September 9th, the date fixed, M. Koukal, Agent for the Czechoslovak Government, filed with the Registry his Government's cases.

The Hungarian Government has appointed as its Agent before the Court in both the suits M. Ladislav Gajzago, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary. It has also appointed M. Guillaume Paul de Tomcsanyi, former Minister of Justice and Professor at Budapest University, as national judge to sit in the Court, for these two suits.

On October 24th the Hungarian Government filed with the Registry of the Court preliminary objections in respect of both these cases. In these objections, which are couched in identical terms, the Court is asked to declare the application of the Czechoslovak Government to have been submitted too late and that, consequently, they cannot be entertained. By an order of Court joined the Hungarian Government's two preliminary objections and fixed

January 16th, 1933, as the last date on which the Czechoslovak Government may submit a written statement on these objections. It also expressed a wish that, before any argument, the parties should explain their respective views as to the scope of Art. X of Agreement No. II. signed at Paris on April 28th, 1930 (according to which Czechoslovakia, Roumania, and Yugoslavia of the one part, and Hungary of the other part, agree to recognise in certain cases a right of appeal to the Court) in relation to the statutory provisions (including Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations) which govern the jurisdiction and working of the Court.

5. THE EASTERN-GREENLAND CASE.

Since the filing by the Norwegian Government of its rejoinder, which was effected by the date fixed, namely, October 14th, this case is ready for hearing. The Court decided on October 24th to fix November 21st, 1932, as the date for the beginning of the oral proceedings.

6. THE OPTIONAL CLAUSE.

On September 19th, 1932, the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of Persia accredited to the League of Nations, deposited with the League Secretariat the instrument of ratification by the Shah of Persia of the Optional Clause provided in the Protocol of Signature concerning the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

7. PROTOCOL OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1929, RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

On September 14th, 1932, the Chargé d'Affaires of Venezuela at Berne deposited with the League Secretariat the instrument of ratification of the Protocol relating to the accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, concluded at Geneva on September 14th, 1929

8. COMMUNICATION OF TREATIES.

Since July 1st, 1932, the following treaty has been filed with the Registry :—

Date.	Nature of Instrument.	Date of Signature.	Signatories.
August 31st, 1932 ..	Convention concerning conditions of residence and business, commerce and navigation.	Bucharest 7.10.31	Roumania and Sweden.

ANNEX.

Resolutions of the Assembly.

I. Commission of Inquiry for European Union.

The Assembly takes note of the report of the Secretary-General to the Assembly on the work done by the Commission of Inquiry for European Union during the past year ;

It requests the Commission to pursue the work undertaken in conformity with the principles laid down in the resolution of September 17th, 1930 ;

It requests the Commission to submit a report on its further work to the next ordinary session of the Assembly.

II. Legal and Constitutional Questions.

1. AMENDMENT OF RULES 4 AND 17 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly decides to amend its Rules of Procedure by inserting the following provisions :

Rule 4, New Paragraph 4 bis.

No proposal for the placing of a new question on the agenda of the Assembly may be signed by more than 15 (fifteen) Members of the League.

Rule 17, New Paragraph 1 bis.

No resolution, amendment or motion may be signed by more than 15 (fifteen) Members of the League.

2. DELETION OF RULE 12 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly decides that Rule 12 of its Rules of Procedure shall be deleted.

3. ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PROTOCOL OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1929, CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

The Assembly,

Having noted the report of the Secretary-General on the situation as regards ratification of the Protocol of September 14th, 1929, concerning the revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice :

Observes with satisfaction that, the Government of Cuba having felt able to withdraw the reservations to which its ratification of the Protocol was subject, the obstacle which last year appeared to lie in the way of the entry into force of the Protocol has been removed ;

Addresses an urgent appeal to the States which, having ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and signed the Protocol of September 14th, 1929, have not yet ratified the latter, that such ratification be effected as soon as possible ; and, if they should consider that peremptory reasons prevent them from ratifying the Protocol, requests them to inform the Secretary-General without delay of the nature of those reasons ;

Instructs the Secretary-General to inform the Members of the League immediately of the deposit of each new ratification and of any communication as to the causes which prevent a State from ratifying the Protocol ;

Instructs the Secretary-General, on the receipt of the last ratification which is necessary for the entry into force of the Protocol, to notify its entry into force to the Governments of the States concerned and to the Registrar of the Permanent Court of International Justice ;

Instructs the Secretary-General to send to the States mentioned in paragraph 3 copies of the present resolution and of the statements made by the Rapporteur, M. Massimo Pilotti, and the former President of the Permanent Court of International Justice, M. Max Huber, of the reasons for desiring an early entry into force of the Protocol of 1929.

4. NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

The Assembly,

Having considered with the greatest interest the report of the Secretary-General containing the observations submitted by Governments on the subject of the nationality of women in accordance with the resolution of the twelfth Assembly, together with the observations of the Committee of Representatives of Women's International Organisations and the petitions of the " Catholic Women and Catholic Men " ;

Considering that the Codification Conference did not intend to embody in the provisions of the " Convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws " any principle in contradiction with the independence of the nationality of married women, but rather to put an end to certain difficulties which arise from existing divergencies between the law governing the matter in different countries (Articles 8, 9 and 11), and that Article 10 even contains a formal application of the principle of independence ; and that the Hague Codification Conference, by its recommendation No. VI, requested States " to examine whether it would not be possible :

" (1) To introduce into their law the principle of the equality of the sexes in matters of nationality, taking particularly into consideration the interests of the children,

" (2) And especially to decide that, in principle, the nationality of the wife shall henceforth not be affected without her consent either by the mere fact of marriage or by any change in the nationality of her husband ";

Noting that, in their observations, a large number of Governments express the opinion that Articles 8 to 11 of the Hague Convention represent the degree of progress which can at present be obtained by way of general international agreement in regard to the question of the nationality of women ;

Considering that any amendment outside the normal procedure for revision would prove impracticable and, therefore, that it is not possible even to eliminate from the text the words that seem to have created a misconception as to a discrimination of sexes in regard to nationality ;

Being satisfied, therefore, that the coming into force of Articles 8 to 11 would in no way prejudice further concerted international action, when such action becomes practicable ;

Recognising that their coming into force would not, in the meantime, place any restriction upon the freedom of action of any State that may desire to give further effect in its nationality laws to the principle of the equality of the sexes ;

Considering, finally, the question of the nationality of women to be in process of evolution and connected with the change of women's position in social, economic and political life :

Expresses the hope that the States which have already signed the Hague Nationality Convention will introduce such legislation as may be necessary to give effect thereto, and will deposit their ratifications at an early date ;

Draws the attention of the States that have not yet passed the necessary legislative measures to give effect to the Convention to the possibility of enacting their internal legislative measures in a form more appropriate to meet the wishes of the women's organisations ;

Instructs the Secretary-General from time to time to ask the Governments to give him information as to the effect which they have found it possible to give to the Recommendation No. VI of the Codification Conference ;

Requests the Council, on the basis of the information so obtained, to follow the development of public opinion on this important question, in order to determine when such development has reached a point at which further concerted international action would be justified.

III. Technical Organisations.

I. WORK OF THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

The Assembly,

Notes with pleasure that a number of Governments have responded to the appeal made last year on behalf of the flood victims in China, and

Thanks these Governments for their generous action, which constitutes a tangible proof of their spirit of international solidarity ;

Is gratified that Governments and their health administrations are increasingly contributing to, and having recourse to, the experience of the Health Organisation in relation to those questions of hygiene on which the international co-operation provided by that Organisation is essential to progress, and values particularly the machinery which permits such Governments to obtain consultative opinions and the technical collaboration of that Organisation ;

Considers that the Health Organisation, by means of its expert inquiries, its service of epidemiological intelligence, including that of the Eastern Bureau, and by the missions undertaken under its authority, fulfils the requirements of Article 23 of the Covenant, by virtue of which the League of Nations will endeavour to take international measures to prevent and combat disease ;

Takes note of the report which has been submitted to it on the work of the Health Organisation, and approves the work carried out by that Organisation since the last session of the Assembly.

2. ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL QUESTIONS.

The Assembly,

1. Approves the report submitted to it by the Second Committee ;

2. Asserts its conviction that the grave problems of the hour raised by the crisis can only find a solution in the effective and immediate co-operation of all countries, both in the sphere of trade and in that of finance ;

Considers that the most urgent task of the coming Economic and Financial Conference must be to seek all practical means of eliminating as speedily as possible the impediments of every kind that are paralysing international trade, and to facilitate the adjustments necessary for monetary stability and the restoration of credit ;

Urgently and solemnly appeals to all the Governments that will be represented at the Conference to make every contribution in their power to the solution of the present difficulties, and to enlighten public opinion as to the necessity of making the concessions indispensable to an international economic understanding, that being the sole means of restoring a normal situation ;

Calls the attention of the Economic and Financial Conference and of those who are responsible for the preparation of that Conference to the resolution passed on April 30th, 1932, by the International Labour Conference and transmitted by the Council to the Assembly, and to the results of the Stresa Conference ;

3. Thanks the Financial Committee for the great labour it has devoted to the difficult and arduous task that has fallen to it during the past year ;

Notes with satisfaction that the Gold Delegation of the Financial Committee has completed its work and published its final report, to which it desires again to draw the attention of all authorities responsible for monetary policy ;

4. Calls the attention of the Governments of all countries to the new procedure established by the Council with a view to the *amicable settlement of disputes of an economic nature between States*, to which it will be permissible for them to have recourse as from January 1st next ;

5. (a) Being informed that the three draft *veterinary Conventions* prepared by the Economic Committee are regarded by many Governments as suitable to serve as a basis of discussion at an international diplomatic conference, expresses the desire that this diplomatic Conference may be convened during 1933 ;

(b) Being informed that the Economic Committee is actively conducting inquiries into the veterinary problems raised by the trade in live cattle and meat, hopes that the States concerned will be kept informed of the progress of this work, the ultimate aim of which is the preparation of one or more conventions relating to the import of live cattle and meat ;

6. Expresses the hope that the countries on which the entry into force of the *three Conventions concerning bills of exchange and promissory notes* depends will make a point of contributing, by their speedy adhesion, to the progressive unification of this important section of private international law ;

7. Expresses the wish that the Economic Organisation of the League of Nations should continue to follow closely and support the work of the International Committee on Inter-co-operative Relations, and that it should endeavour, in collaboration with the International Labour Office, to find the best means of making available to those concerned the information collected for this Committee concerning the progress of co-operation in the different countries.

8. Notes with satisfaction the resolution adopted by the Council of the League of Nations to submit the question of *large-scale public works* to the Preparatory Commission of the coming Economic and Financial Conference.

3. WORK OF THE COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT ORGANISATION BETWEEN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH ORDINARY SESSIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly,

Having considered the work accomplished by the Communications and Transit Organisation between the twelfth and thirteenth ordinary sessions of the Assembly ;

Greatly appreciates the results obtained in the Organisation's various spheres of activity ;

Expresses, in particular, its satisfaction with the conclusions reached by the Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit, and trusts that those conclusions will lead to good results ;

Attaches special importance to the work accomplished by the Committee of Inquiry on Questions relating to Public Works and National Technical Equipment ;

Notes with satisfaction the close collaboration that has been established between the Organisation and the Chinese National Government, and expresses its conviction that this collaboration will be wholly successful.

IV. Work of the International Organisation for Intellectual Co-operation.

1. RESOLUTION.

General Resolution :

The Assembly;

Having considered the report of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation on the work of its fourteenth session and the report of the Governing Body of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation ;

Noting the contents of the reports submitted by the representative of France to the Council at its last session, both on the activities of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and on its methods of work and organisation :

(1) Observes with satisfaction the important results obtained during the past year, and

Approves as a whole the programme of work of the Organisation for the year 1932-33 ;

Education :

(2) Emphasises the importance of the formation of national educational information centres and the establishment of direct relations between those organisations, with the help of the International Centre constituted by the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, and trusts that the other forms of international co-operation which are now being organised in regard to the various stages of education will be developed ;

Revision of School Text-books :

(3) Appreciates the results of the efforts made to provide a procedure for facilitating the revision of school text-books, and attaches the greatest importance to the documentary material collected on this question by the Institute ;

Subject to the explanations given in the Committee's report, approves the more extensive application of the Casares resolution, as recommended by the Committee ;

Instruction on the League of Nations :

(4) Emphasises the importance which it attaches to all questions connected with the instruction of youth in the aims of the League and to the promotion of an international spirit ;

Is glad to note the action taken in this sphere both by the Educational Information Centre at Geneva and by the Paris Centre, and draws the attention of Governments in particular to the

inquiry now in progress concerning the education of teachers in training colleges with a view to their giving instruction regarding the League;

Re-organisation of Education in China :

(5) Desires to place on record the special value of the assistance given by the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation in the study of educational problems in China and in the work of re-organisation which the Chinese Government proposes to undertake;

Thanks the distinguished persons who have been good enough to co-operate with the League in this matter and through whose zeal the important achievements realised have been made possible;

Expresses the hope that this co-operation, so successfully begun, will be further extended in the same spirit of comprehension and practical activity;

Broadcasting :

(6) Notes that the Organisation has given effect to the recommendations made by the Assembly at its last session concerning the international aspects of broadcasting;

Attaches special importance to the meeting of experts whose duty it will be to examine the conditions which international agreements concerning broadcasting should fulfil;

Moral Disarmament :

(7) Expresses its satisfaction with the valuable co-operation which the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation has been able to afford to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, with a view to the study of the problem of moral disarmament;

Trusts that the Conference may find it possible, on the completion of its work, to include among the documents setting forth its results an act in a form to be determined later, which would assist the efforts that are being made to bring about the intellectual *rapprochement* of the peoples;

Is convinced that, in this field, the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation can place at the disposal of Governments means of action of proved effectiveness;

Scientific Study of International Relations :

(8) In connection with the scientific study of international relations, the Assembly trusts that the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation will extend still further its activities in this sphere and will endeavour to give wide publicity to the results of conferences such as the Milan Conference;

Intellectual Rôle of the Press :

(9) Whereas the Press plays a part of the first importance in the education of the masses, and may be counted upon to provide powerful assistance in raising their intellectual level;

The Assembly asks the Organisation for Intellectual Co-operation to seek the most effective means of completely attaining this end, and

Requests it, in consultation with the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation and representative journalists, to study the methods by which the Press might contribute to a better understanding between the peoples by perfecting their knowledge. The conclusions of this study shall be submitted to the fourteenth Assembly;

National Committees :

(10) Recognises once again the important part played by the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation and the necessity of encouraging those already in existence and of affording them additional means of carrying out the more and more numerous tasks of increasing importance which they have to perform;

Preservation of Historical Monuments :

(11) The Assembly,
Approving the resolution adopted by the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and acceding to the latter's request that it should communicate to the Members of the League the recommendations drawn up by the Athens Conference concerning the preservation of historical monuments and works of art;

Entrusts to the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation the task of transmitting the said recommendations to the Governments on its behalf;

Administrative Questions :

(12) Having noted the results of the administration of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation as shown by the report of the Governing Body of that Institute:

Expresses its satisfaction with the excellent methods employed which have made it possible to develop the activities of this organisation and, at the same time, to consolidate its financial position;

International Educational Cinematographic Institute :

(13) Having considered the report of the Governing Body of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute:

Expresses its satisfaction with the systematic development of that Institute's work and, in particular, with the results of the numerous inquiries already completed or at present in progress.

Has pleasure in recognising once again the value of the *International Review* published by the Institute and the friendly reception given to it both in educational circles and by the technical experts of the film industry;

Trusts that the Institute, by extending its activity in those spheres which already engage the attention of the League of Nations, may be able to promote the use of the powerful means of dissemination represented by the cinema in favour of the League's work.

2. DRAFT CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

The Assembly,

Notes with satisfaction the result of the work accomplished by the Special Committee which it had appointed to examine the draft Convention for facilitating the international circulation of films of an educational character ;

Is of opinion that the changes proposed by the Special Committee are calculated to facilitate the accession of several of the States to this Convention, which, in its broad outline, has received the approval of numerous delegations, but considers that these changes call for a fresh examination on the part of the Governments concerned ;

And, having regard to the importance that attaches to a speedy settlement of the question, requests the Council to convene a meeting of Government delegates at whatever time it considers most suitable, but if possible at the time of the forthcoming extraordinary session of the Assembly, provided always that all the Governments have been able to examine the new draft Convention. At this meeting, the delegates, being in possession of full powers, would be called upon to decide whether the proposed Convention, with or without amendment, is to be opened for signature by any Member of the League or any State non-member. In the meantime, the Governments concerned might send their observations to the Secretary-General.

V. Organisation of Peace.

I. CO-OPERATION OF THE PRESS IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

The thirteenth Assembly ;

1. Expresses its gratitude to the international and national Press organisations for their views upon the problem of preventing " the spread of false information which may threaten the peace of the world and the good understanding between nations " ;

2. Expresses its thanks to the Danish Government for summoning a Conference of Governmental Press Bureaux and representatives of the Press at Copenhagen in January, 1932, and notes with great interest the resolutions adopted by that Conference ;

3. Trust that, at a further conference organised on similar lines to the Copenhagen Conference, definite proposals may be made to give effect to some of the principal suggestions already made regarding in particular the necessity of a greater abundance of accurate information, of true freedom of the Press, and of co-operation between the Press organisations of various countries ;

4. Advocates the fullest possible publicity for League meetings ;

5. Commends to the sympathetic consideration of the chairman of all committees of the League of Nations the earlier and more complete distribution of documents ;

6. Desires that the Secretariat should continue to devote its attention to the development by all the means at its disposal of the swift supply to the Press of the fullest possible information concerning the work of the League of Nations ;

7. Invites the Council to consider the possibilities of affording to journalists cheap facilities for communicating to their newspapers information through the League wireless station, due regard being paid to interests affected ;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to communicate to the Press organisations consulted and to the Disarmament Conference this resolution, together with the Minutes of the Sixth Committee, and to report to the next Assembly on any further developments which may arise.

2. COLLABORATION OF WOMEN IN THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE.

The Assembly,

Expresses its warm appreciation of the work done by women in support of the League of Nations, and welcomes wholeheartedly the efforts made to increase their collaboration ;

Notes that the Women's Organisations consulted are unanimous in declaring that equal status between men and women is a prerequisite of effective collaboration of women in the work of the League and that their collaboration can be most effectively exercised through the competent official organs of the League and of the Governments ;

Reminds all the States Members of the League of Article 7 of the Covenant, which has in view the possibility :

(a) For the Governments of the States Members to appoint competent women to Assembly delegations, to Conferences and on Governmental Committees of the League ;

(b) For the Council to appoint competent women on technical League Committees, as assessors and experts ;

(c) For the Secretary-General to include competent women in the higher posts of the Secretariat.

VI. Administrative Questions.

MANDATES.

The Assembly,

Having taken note of the work accomplished by the Mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council in regard to the execution of Article 22 of the Covenant :

(a) Renews the expression of confidence in them voted by the past sessions of the Assembly, and again expresses its appreciation of the results they have achieved through a spirit of co-operation which it is essential to maintain ;

- (b) Expresses its particular gratification at the progress made under the mandate system in Iraq, thanks to which that country has been able to gain complete independence and admission to the League ;
- (c) Considers it highly desirable that the decision reached by the Assembly at its twelfth session to reduce the annual ordinary sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission from two to one should not in future be renewed, even as an exceptional measure, inasmuch as it would have the result of seriously hampering the effective and regular performance of the important duties entrusted to the League of Nations by Article 22 of the Covenant.

VII. Political Questions.

APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE OF NINETEEN SET UP BY THE ASSEMBLY AT ITS SPECIAL SESSION.

The Assembly,

Having in view the request made by the Chairman of the Committee of Nineteen set up by the Assembly at its special session in regard to the appointment of a member of that Committee ;

Considers that effect should be given to that request so as to conform to the intention of the Assembly which, by its resolution of March 11th, 1932, fixed the number of members which the Committee should comprise ;

And therefore decides, in application of Rule 4, paragraph 4, and Rule 14, paragraph 2, of its Rules of Procedure, to insert this question in the agenda of its thirteenth ordinary session, and to proceed without other formalities or delay to the appointment of a member of the Committee.

VIII. Social and Humanitarian Questions.

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

I.

The Assembly,

Having taken note with great interest and satisfaction of the work carried on during the past year by the Traffic in Women and Children Committee ;

Sharing the Committee's opinion that the traffic in women is always and in all circumstances a profoundly immoral and anti-social act and that this traffic should be punished even if the victims are over age and consent ;

Requests the Governments to introduce as soon as possible the necessary modifications on this subject in their national legislations ;

Decides to seek a revision of the international Conventions on the Traffic in Women and Children of 1910 and 1921 by abolishing the age-limit contained in the said Conventions ; and

Asks the Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children to study, with the advice of its Legal Sub-Committee, the means by which the above-mentioned Conventions may be revised with regard to the age-limit simultaneously with the amendments proposed for the punishment of *souteneurs*.

II.

The Assembly,

Noting that the reports of the 1932 sessions of the Traffic in Women and Children Committee and the Child Welfare Committee lay special stress on the need of increased publicity for their work ;

(1) Recognising gratefully the efforts of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies to educate public opinion in all countries in support of the League of Nations ;

Requests it especially to consider, and to apply, as urgently as possible, methods of giving wider publicity to the reports of the League of Nations on the subject of the traffic in women and children and of child welfare ;

(2) Recognising the great value of the services which have been rendered in each of the two Committees which compose the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People by international organisations represented on them by assessors ;

Urgently appeals to those private organisations to give, by all the means which lie in their power or which they are able to put into action, more publicity to the work of the two Committees in which they collaborate with so much competence and efficiency.

2. CHILD WELFARE.

The Assembly of the League of Nations,

Noting that the reports of the 1932 sessions of the Traffic in Women and Children Committee and the Child Welfare Committee lay special stress on the need on increased publicity for their work ;

I.

Recognising with gratitude the efforts of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies to educate public opinion in all countries in support of the League of Nations ;

Requests it especially to consider, and to apply as urgently as possible, methods of giving wider publicity to the reports of the League of Nations on the subject of the traffic in women and children and of child welfare.

II.

Recognising the great value of the services which have been rendered in each of the two Committees which compose the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People by international organisations represented on them by assessors ;

Urgently appeals to those private organisations to give, by all the means which lie in their power of which they are able to put into action, more publicity to the work of the two Committees in which they collaborate with so much competence and efficiency.

Considering that the work done by the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People and by its Secretariat is of primary social importance—a fact which is unanimously recognised in all countries—and that this work is wholly in conformity with the duties which the Covenant places on the League of Nations ;

Noting with regret that the means at the disposal of this Commission and its Secretariat have already been drastically reduced and appear to be disproportionate to those assigned to other forms of League activities :

The Fifth Committee, although it is prepared, in view of the present financial situation, not to ask this year for any increase in the budgetary estimates for the Commission and its Secretariat, an increase nevertheless required for the proper expansion of its work, and in particular for : (1) the publication of the Minutes of the two Committees of which the Commission consists, which has been discontinued for the past year, and (2) the participation in its work of experts for certain special questions referred to it ;

Confidently hopes that the Fourth Committee will adopt without reduction the budgetary estimates for 1933, both ordinary and supplementary, submitted to it for the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People and its Secretariat.

3. PENAL AND PENITENTIARY QUESTIONS.

The Assembly calls the very special attention of the Governments to the joint reply made by the seven technical organisations consulted by the League of Nations on the questions of the progressive unification of penal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and punishment of crime.

4. SLAVERY.

The Assembly,

Notes the report of the Committee of Experts on Slavery which was transmitted to it by the Council's resolution of September 23rd, 1932 ;

Expresses its appreciation of the excellent work done by the Committee of Experts ;

Draws the attention of the Governments of the Members of the League and of the States parties to the 1926 Convention to the opinions and suggestions contained in the report of the Committee of Experts, and hopes that the organs of the League will be kept informed of the measures which the Governments continue to take for the total abolition of the slave trade and of slavery in its different forms ;

Decides that an advisory Committee of Experts shall be constituted, whose composition, competence and functions are described in the annex to the present resolution ;

Requests the Secretary-General to include in his draft budget for 1934 the necessary credit for this Committee ; and

Requests the Council to take, in the interval, all measures not requiring budgetary credit and which will conduce to the carrying out of the proposals which have been made.

Annex.

A. The Committee shall consist of seven members chosen solely for their special knowledge of slavery questions, all the members being of different nationalities. They shall be appointed for an undefined term, the Council retaining the right to renew the composition of the Committee every six years. The duties of the Committee, which will meet once every two years, if necessary, will be strictly advisory and it will have no powers of supervision ; its task will be :

(1) To study and examine the documents supplied or transmitted by Governments to the Secretariat ;

(2) To study, on the basis of such documents and of the special knowledge of its members the facts and institutions mentioned in Article 1 of the 1926 Slavery Convention and to examine their rôle in the social system ;

(3) To study the means of gradually abolishing these institutions or customs, or of causing them to develop in such a way as to deprive them of any objectionable features ;

(4) If a country where slavery exists asks for financial assistance from the League of Nations in settling questions relating to the abolition of slavery, the Committee will, at the request of the Council, examine the objects for which this financial assistance is requested, the minimum amount necessary and the guarantees offered ;

(5) The Committee shall not deal with questions relating to Article 5 of the 1926 Slavery Convention.

The Committee's proceedings will be confidential.

At the termination of each session, the Committee will submit a report to the Council ; and the Council shall decide whether the whole or part of this report should be published.

The Committee will draw up its own rules to regulate its proceedings and these shall be submitted for the approval of the Council.

In carrying out its duties the Committee is to observe the following rules :

(1) The consultation of organisations or persons on facts concerning slavery is not permitted. These organisations or persons will have to send their complaints or observations through the intermediary of their respective Governments.

(2) If a communication concerning a country is addressed to the Committee by the Government of another State, the Committee shall transmit it, through the intermediary of the Council, to the Government of the country concerned for its observations.

(3) The Committee shall not be competent to hear depositions.

It is understood that, in agreeing to the setting up of this Committee, the Governments parties to the Slavery Convention of 1926 do not assume any obligation of such a nature as to modify those they have entered into in virtue of that Convention.

B. The Secretariat of the Committee will be provided by the Secretariat of the League of Nations. Its task will be :

(1) To receive the documents sent to the League of Nations in virtue of Article 7 of the Slavery Convention and all other documents which the Governments may transmit on subjects concerning slavery ;

(2) To collect, for the use of the members of the Committee, information and surveys published concerning slavery ;

(3) To make a methodical classification of all documents and information.

5. RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN, ASSYRIAN, ASSYRO-CHALDEAN, AND TURKISH REFUGEES.

The Assembly,

Notes with satisfaction the interesting report of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for Refugees and the important work in favour of distressed refugees throughout the world effected during the past year by the Office in spite of the difficulties created by the economic depression ; and

Expresses its gratitude to the organs of the Office, and particularly to its President, Dr. Max Huber, for their devoted efforts which have so much contributed to those results ;

Hopes that a satisfactory arrangement may soon be made between the Governing Body and the Mandatory Power for the future care of the refugee population in Syria ;

Requests the Office to examine the possibility of effecting the transfer to the Armenian (Erivan) Republic of a further 20,000 Armenian refugees from other countries who may express the desire to be settled in Erivan ;

Recalls the offers of financial and other assistance made by various Governments in connection with the Erivan Settlement Scheme initiated by Dr. Nansen ;

Invites those Governments to consider the possibility of placing at the disposal of the Office the financial and other assistance formerly promised to Dr. Nansen ;

Recommends the national committees nominated by the Governments for the purpose of obtaining funds for the Erivan Settlement Scheme to resume their efforts for obtaining funds, and invites the Governments which have not already done so to nominate such committees ;

Requests the Office to endeavour to alleviate the unfortunate situation of the 20,000 Russian refugees in China rendered destitute by recent floods ;

Expresses the hope that the various private organisations interested in refugee work may agree to co-operate with the Office as far as possible, and invites the Office to make a report on this subject to the Council at an early date ;

In order to place more adequate funds at the disposal of the Office :

Once more strongly recommends the Governments to apply fully the Nansen Stamp System and to initiate the creation on their territories of national committees for the Nansen Memorial Fund ;

Urges Governments not to proceed to the expulsion of a refugee unless he has obtained permission to enter an adjoining country ;

Requests the Council to take the necessary action on this resolution.

IX. Budgetary and Internal Organisation Questions.

1. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS.

The Assembly decides that, for a period of two years from October 15th, 1932 :

(1) All future contracts, whether contracts for the retention of the services of officials of the Secretariat, the International Labour Office or the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice whose appointments expire or contracts with new officials, shall be made on the basis of a 10 per cent. reduction of the existing salary scales of the categories of officials in question (such reduction applying also to the increments) and shall provide that the Assembly shall be entitled unilaterally to change the salaries fixed thereby ;

(2) Members of the staff of these organisations, on promotion to a higher grade, shall be placed upon rates or scales of salary lower by 10 per cent. than those now payable to the grades in question, except that the initial salary payable after such promotion shall not be less than the salary received prior to promotion ;

(3) It is understood that the above provisions will apply neither to temporary staff engaged on short-term contracts and serving on rates of pay already reduced, nor to officials who receive a salary equal to, or less than, 6,500 francs per annum.

The Assembly, on the basis, among others, of the proposals submitted to it by the Supervisory Commission, requests the latter to proceed to a detailed study of the possibilities of effecting economies in the expenditure of the League of Nations by means of a technical concentration of its activities and by any other means of reorganisation and rationalisation in the services of the

Secretariat and of the International Labour Office, on condition, however, that these measures should in no way hamper the essential functions of the League.

The Assembly requests the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, which has already undertaken studies and adopted measures in this direction, to lend its assistance with a view to this study as regards the International Labour Office and its co-operation with the Secretariat.

For the purposes of this examination, the Supervisory Commission may enlist the assistance of special experts.

The Supervisory Commission is requested to submit to the next ordinary session of the Assembly a report on the results of this examination.

It is understood that posts which, as a result of this examination, may be regarded as superfluous may be abolished by the Secretary-General even before the said session.

Nevertheless, in the case of larger readjustments, the Secretary-General should first submit the question to the Council for approval.

The Assembly requests the Secretary-General to examine, in each case in which an existing contract comes to an end or a post becomes vacant for any other reason, whether it is possible to postpone the appointment of new officials in order to permit of a detailed examination of the necessity to the League's activities of the duties in question.

The Assembly :

Takes note of the report of the Administrative Board of the Staff Pensions Fund for the year 1932;

Sanctions the admission, in accordance with the recommendation of the Board, of eight officials of the Secretariat whose applications for membership were received after December 31st, 1931 ;

Adopts the report on the valuation of the Fund as submitted by the Fund's consulting actuary ;

And decides :

That the assets of the Provident Fund shall be transferred to the Pensions Fund subject to leaving with the Provident Fund a sum in cash equal to the balances of the accounts of its members and an appropriate share of the Death and Invalidity Fund ;

That any shortage due to the depreciation of the assets taken over from the Provident Fund shall be amortised, if necessary, after the period of thirty years fixed by Article 7 (b) of the Regulations.

That the contribution of the League to the Pensions Fund for 1933 shall be 9 per cent. of the pensionable emoluments of the members of the Fund ;

That its contribution in respect of arrears due for service prior to January 1st, 1931, shall be at the same rate of contribution as was fixed for 1931 ;

That no credit shall be inserted in the budget for 1933 to supplement the contributions paid by officials of branch offices in depreciated currencies ;

And that the League's contribution to the amortisation, in accordance with Article 7 (b) of the Regulations, of the deficit in the Pensions Fund due to the application of the Regulations to officials already in the service on January 1st, 1931, shall be 400,000 Swiss francs for 1933.

The Assembly requests the Committee on the Allocation of Expenses to initiate a study of new bases for the allocation of the League's expenditure, in order that they may be examined at the fourteenth session of the Assembly. These bases would be established by taking as chief criterion the items of the national budgets referring more directly to international relations, and, in particular, the budgets for foreign affairs, national defence services and the political and commercial propaganda services of the States.

1. The Assembly, in virtue of Article 38 of the Regulations for the Financial Administration of the League of Nations, finally passes the audited accounts of the League of Nations for the thirteenth financial period, ending on December 31st, 1931.

2. The Assembly,

In virtue of Article 17 of the Regulations for the Financial Administration of the League of Nations :

Passes for the financial period 1933 the budget of the League of Nations to the total sum of 33,429,132 francs ;

And decides that the aforesaid budget shall be published in the *Official Journal*.

3. The Assembly, in conformity with the recommendation of the Committee on the Allocation of Expenses, fixes at ten the number of units assigned to Turkey in 1933, and at three that assigned to Iraq, in the scale for the allocation of the League's expenditure.

4. The Assembly adopts the conclusions of the various reports of the Supervisory Commission, submitted for its consideration, except in regard to the question referred to in Chapter V of the present report.

5. The Assembly appoints to the Supervisory Commission for the period ending on December 31st, 1935 : as regular member, His Excellency M. C. PARRA-PÉREZ ; and as substitute members, M. G. DE OTTLIK and His Excellency M. Jean DE MODZELEWSKI.

6. The Assembly adopts the present report of the Fourth Committee.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS IN ARREARS.

The Assembly,

Notes with regret and grave concern that a number of States have not fulfilled their financial obligations towards the League of Nations ;

Appeals to all Member States to liquidate their arrears without delay and to demonstrate thereby their attachment to the ideals of the League of Nations ;

Requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts for the recovery of arrears, to report to the Council on the action taken by him before the next ordinary session of the Assembly and to communicate the results to the latter ;

Decides, in pursuance of the resolution taken by the Assembly at its twelfth session, to exempt Nicaragua from the payment of half of its contribution to the budget for the financial year 1933 and to defer the payment of the balance.

3. QUESTION OF THE PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND COGNATE QUESTIONS.

I.—*Declaration of Loyalty.*

The Assembly ;

Decides that the Secretary-General and all officials of the rank of Director or above shall in future make the following declaration before the Council in public session :

I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience the functions that have been entrusted to me as (Secretary-General) of the League of Nations, to discharge my functions and to regulate my conduct with the interests of the League alone in view and not to seek or receive instructions from any Government or other authority external,

For the Secretary-General : to the League of Nations.

For the Other Officials : to the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

That officials of Division I. below the rank of Director shall make and sign a similar declaration before the Appointments Committee, and officials of Divisions II. and III. before the Sub-Appointments Committee ;

That the above shall not however apply to officials engaged for a temporary period of less than one year.

It requests the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to lay down that the Director, Deputy Director and Chiefs of Division of the International Labour Office shall, at a public meeting, make a similar declaration before it and that for officials of lower rank the procedure laid down for the Secretariat shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to the International Labour Office.

II.—*Principal Officers.*

I.—The Assembly ;

Once more affirms the principle that the holders of the highest posts of the Secretariat up to that of Secretary-General should, like all the officials of the League of Nations, be chosen for their abilities, their personal qualifications, and the contribution they can make to the performance of the tasks of the League of Nations.

To facilitate the application of this principle and in order to give the Members which are not permanently represented on the Council a larger share in the responsibilities devolving on the principal officers of the Secretariat, it decides that there shall be two posts of Deputy Secretary-General. This would make it possible to assign one of these posts to a national of a Member not permanently represented on the Council in the event of the Secretary-General having been chosen from among the nationals of Members permanently represented on the Council.

In view of the principle of universality of the League of Nations, it would be advisable, when the posts of principal officers in the Secretariat are being filled, to take also into account the chief geographic divisions in conformity with the principles adopted for the composition of other leading bodies of the League of Nations.

II.—(a) There shall be three Under-Secretaries-General.

(b) It is undesirable that the title of Legal Adviser be altered, in view of the non-political character of the post. The rank of the Legal Adviser shall, however, be the same as that of an Under-Secretary-General, and he shall be included in the category of the highest officials of the Secretariat.

III.—The decision obtained on clause I. was greatly facilitated by agreement that the offices of the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretaries-General should not include more than one member of Section who is a national of the same Member of the League as the holders of these posts.

IV.—The Secretary-General shall be appointed for ten, the Deputy Secretaries-General for eight, and the Under-Secretaries-General for seven years. The appointment of the Secretary-General may be renewed for three years, those of the Deputy Secretaries-General for five years and those of the Under-Secretaries-General for a further single period of seven years.

V.—A further point of agreement was that, in order to give effect to the previous wishes of the Assembly that a more equitable distribution of nationalities be effected, not more than two nationals of any one Member of the League should be included among the high officials of the Secretariat (Secretary-General, Deputy Secretaries-General, Legal Adviser and Under-Secretaries-General, and Directors), and that the principle should be carried into effect at the earliest possible moment, existing contracts remaining unaffected.

III.—*Private Secretariats of the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretaries-General, and the Under-Secretaries-General.*

The Assembly;

Decides that only the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretaries-General shall henceforth have a private secretariat, which shall not include more than two members of Section.

The Under-Secretaries-General shall each be entitled to have among the members of the Section which they direct one collaborator of their own nationality ranking as member of Section.

IV.—*Salaries and Entertainment Allowances of the Secretary-General the Deputy Secretaries-General, and the Under-Secretaries-General.*

The Assembly,

Decides that the scale of salaries and of entertainment allowances of the principal officers shall be as follows:—

	Salaries	Entertainment Allowance.
	Swiss francs	
Secretary-General	90,000	50,000
Deputy Secretaries-General	60,000	25,000
Under-Secretaries-General.. ..	60,000	10,000

All future contracts shall be drawn up in Swiss francs.

V.—*Salaries of the Director and Deputy Director of the International Labour Office.*

A. Whereas there is a close relation between the high officials of the League and it is the Assembly's duty to review the salaries of the Director and Deputy Director of the International Labour Organisation:

Whereas, on the other hand, while the Assembly is finally competent to settle all budgetary questions, the governing Body of the International Labour Office should be given the possibility of pronouncing upon the question,

The Assembly;

Decides to enter in the 1933 Budget a lump sum of 105,000 francs, to cover both the salary and the entertainment allowance for that year of the Director of the International Labour Office.

B. Whereas the Governing Body of the International Labour Office had not yet taken a decision as to whether the vacant post of Deputy Director is to be maintained or abolished,

The Assembly;

Is of opinion that, should it be decided to fill the post, the principle should prevail as before that the Deputy Director of the International Labour Office should be on the same scale of salary as applies to the Under-Secretaries-General and that the Deputy Director's salary should be 60,000 Swiss francs and his entertainment allowance 10,000 Swiss francs;

And decides to enter in the Budget a lump sum of 70,000 Swiss francs.

VI.—*Directors' Salaries.*

The Assembly,

Decides that the salaries of the present Directors of the Secretariat shall not be modified;

That, nevertheless, the general 10 per cent. cut which is to be applied during a period of two years to new appointments of League officials shall apply also to Directors appointed during the same period;

Whereas, moreover, for reasons of equity, the rule should not affect officials who were already in the service of the League on September 15th, 1931;

Decides that it will not apply to Directors at present in the service whose contracts may be renewed during that period.

VII.—*General Entertainment Fund.*

A. Whereas the principle of a reduction which applies to the entertainment allowances of the Principal Officers of the Secretariat, should also apply to the general entertainment fund,

The Assembly,

Decides to reduce the figure included in the 1933 Budget for the purpose from 36,620 to 30,000 francs.

B. The Assembly.

Considers that a similar reduction should be made in the general entertainment fund of the International Labour Office and decides that the figure 30,000 included in the 1933 Budget for the purpose should be reduced to 25,000 francs.

C. Requests the Supervisory Commission to re-examine the rules governing the apportionment of the general entertainment funds.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

JUST OUT.

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN

OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENTS

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, V. 2)

11 pages Price : 6d. \$0.15

OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENTS SECOND SERIES

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, V.4)

3 pages Price : 6d. \$0.15

These documents contain the replies of Governments to an inquiry as to their views regarding the Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws signed at The Hague on 12th April, 1930, and on the question of further examination by the League of the subject of the nationality of women.

OBSERVATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, V. 3.)

6 pages Price : 6d. \$0.15

COLLABORATION OF WOMEN IN THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, 4)

19 pages Price : 9d. \$0.20

Complete Catalogue sent free on application.

**PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
LEAGUE OF NATIONS
GENEVA**

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. II.

NOVEMBER, 1932.

New
Disarmament Proposals

Renewal
of the Armaments Truce

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - 1/-.
Double Number - 2/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.
Double Number - - 40c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Vol. XII., No. II.

NOVEMBER, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
I. <i>Summary of the Month, November, 1932</i>	320	3. Danzig: (1) Introduction of the Zloty as the sole Means of Payment on the Danzig Railways: Question of "Direct Action." (2) Appointment of League High Commissioner at Danzig	330
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments:</i>		VIII. <i>Political Questions:</i>	
1. Work of the Commissions	320	1. Appeal by the Chinese Government	330
2. Summary of the French Memorandum	322	2. Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay	333
3. Summary of the United Kingdom Proposals	323	3. Request for Assistance from Liberia	334
4. The Armaments Truce	325	IX. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions:</i>	
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions:</i>		Model Administrative Code for the Application of the 1931 Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs	335
International Engagements: Registration of Treaties	325	X. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	336
IV. <i>Monetary and Economic Conference:</i>			
Meeting of the Preparatory Commission	325	<i>The Permanent Court of International Justice.</i>	
V. <i>Technical Organisations:</i>		1. Interpretation of the Convention of 1919 concerning Employment of Women during the Night	336
Economic and Financial Organisation:		2. The Prince of Pless Administration	337
1. Draft Monetary Normalisation Fund	327	3. Legal Status of certain Parts of Eastern Greenland	337
2. Customs Nomenclature	328		
VI. <i>Intellectual Co-operation:</i>		ANNEX.	
1. The Educational Cinematograph	328	Summary of the Observations of the Japanese Government relative to the Report of the Lytton Commission	339
2. International Meeting of Students	329		
VII. <i>Administrative Questions:</i>			
1. Meeting of the Mandates Commission	329		
2. Frontier between Iraq and Syria	329		

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—SUMMARY OF THE MONTH.

November, 1932.

The main activities of the League during November were meetings of the Council, of the Bureau of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the Preparatory Commission for the Monetary and Economic Conference, the Mandates Commission, and the Committee of Experts for the Monetary Normalisation Fund.

The Council heard the observations of the representatives of the Japanese and Chinese

Governments on the report of the Commission of Inquiry, which it forwarded to the Special Assembly. It also dealt with the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay. In the field of disarmament, the French and British delegations submitted new proposals, and the armaments truce was renewed for a further four months. The Preparatory Commission for the Monetary and Economic Conference held a preliminary exchange of views.

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

I. WORK OF THE COMMISSIONS.

The Bureau of the Conference, meeting from November 3rd to 22nd, with Mr. Henderson in the Chair, in pursuance of its decisions of September 26th and October 15th,* considered the reports of M. Bourquin on Supervision, of M. Pilotti on the Prohibition of Chemical Warfare, of M. Buero on the limits to be fixed for the calibre of heavy artillery and the maximum tonnage of tanks, and of M. de Madariaga on the procedure to be followed in the examination of questions relating to air forces.

In the matter of supervision, the General Commission, by its resolution of July 23rd, had decided that there "should be set up a Permanent Disarmament Commission with the constitution, rights and duties generally as outlined in Part VI. of the draft Convention submitted by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, with such extension of its powers as might be deemed necessary by the Conference"; following the rapporteur's suggestions, the Bureau dealt with the powers, means of supervision, composition and functions of this permanent Commission.

After discussion and the adoption of a supplementary report, the Bureau, on November 15th, referred the points relating to supervision to a drafting Committee consisting of jurists from Belgium, the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. It was understood that this drafting committee would prepare texts suitable for insertion in the draft convention to be submitted to the Bureau before being referred to the General Commission.

As regards the prohibition of chemical warfare and violation of the prohibition to use chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons, the Bureau considered that before reaching any

final decision it was essential to convene a special committee on chemical and bacteriological questions, and to submit to it a technical questionnaire.

In the matter of heavy artillery and tanks, the Bureau recognised that it did not yet seem possible to achieve results in figures, as suggested in the resolution of July 23rd.

With reference to the application of the provisions of the resolution of July 23rd on air forces, the Bureau requested a Committee, consisting of the delegates of those States members of the Bureau who desired to be represented, to consider, on the basis of the resolution in question, the measures to be adopted in order to render effective observance of the prohibition, for both civil and military aviation, to resort to aerial bombardment.

The Bureau nevertheless decided that, whatever decisions it might think fit to take on this subject and whatever studies it might inaugurate with a view to putting the resolution into effect, final decisions should not be taken until later, and in co-operation with all the countries chiefly concerned in the question of aviation.

The Bureau also noted a report submitted by M. Komarnicki (Poland) on the work of the Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Munitions of War. After some discussion the Bureau approved the method of work adopted by the Committee, and asked it, together with its Sub-Committees, to resume work without delay and to consider all the aspects of the problem submitted to it. It felt that there was general agreement that the provisions relating to the trade in and manufacture of arms and munitions of war would be included in the same legal instrument as the Convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments, and accordingly asked the Committee to consider

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 273.

in what conditions equal treatment could be achieved: (a) for producing and non-producing countries; (b) for the various contracting States (special zones, etc. . . .); (c) for State and private manufacture.

The Bureau also asked the Committee to consider whether, within the general framework of supervision already adopted by the Bureau, it was necessary to make provision for technical means particularly suited to purposes of international supervision of the trade in and manufacture of arms.

Where limitation and publicity regarding war material were concerned, the Bureau considered that any final formula should be postponed until suitable solutions had been reached by the competent organs of the Conference. At the same time it drew the Committee's attention to the value of collecting the necessary documentation regarding the licence systems adopted by the different countries, and to studying the possibility of drawing up an international licence system.

* * *

The Bureau held two extraordinary meetings. On November 4th it heard a statement by M. Paul-Boncour (France), prior to submission to the Bureau on November 14th of a memorandum by the French delegation, and on November 17th a statement by Sir John Simon on behalf of the United Kingdom.*

After Sir John Simon's statement the Chairman, Mr. Henderson, emphasised that the object of both the United Kingdom and the French proposals was to indicate the kind of basis upon which it was hoped that the Conference might pursue its labours. The essential co-ordination of the drafts and proposals before the Conference would be promoted were Germany to resume her share in its work. He pointed out that every delegation had admitted that the restrictions imposed upon Germany and her former allies by the Treaty of Versailles were intended to pave the way for a general reduction of armaments. It would be difficult, he thought, to achieve any satisfactory result unless the problem of equality of rights was solved. After recalling the considerations raised in this connection, both in the French Government's Memorandum, in Sir John Simon's speech and in a recent speech by the Italian Prime Minister, he added that these declarations would provide a basis for discussion when seeking a permanent solution of the problem of equality of rights.

* An analysis of the French delegation's Memorandum and of Sir John Simon's statement are annexed to this number of the Monthly Summary.

Any such discussion should be entered upon with clear recognition that the limitation of Germany's armaments and those of her former allies should, as in the case of other signatories, be contained in the Convention drawn up by the Conference. In conclusion, he hoped that the German Government would shortly decide once more to join in the work of the Conference.

M. Rosso (Italy) endorsed the remarks of the President and the United Kingdom delegate.

M. Massigli (France) confirmed on behalf of his Government the texts expressing its views on the question of the equality of rights; he shared the hopes voiced by the President.

Mr. Norman Davis (United States) said that the Conference's task demanded the close co-operation of all nations—among them Germany.

General Burhardt-Bukacki (Poland) said that the problem of equality of rights must shortly come before the Bureau for discussion in close connection with other questions affecting the organisation of peace.

The representatives of Belgium, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, and M. Motta, Honorary President of the Conference, all expressed the hope that the Conference would before long be able to carry on its work with the German delegation in its midst.

* * *

The Technical Committee of Experts of the Special Committee on Effectives, meeting with General van Tuinen (Netherlands) in the Chair, asked for information from all the delegations on their police forces and similar formations, with a view later to determining which of these forces should be taken into account in calculating effectives. It considered the forces of the following States, which had supplied the particulars requested: Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States, and Yugoslavia.

The Colonial Sub-Committee, after electing M. Moresco (Netherlands) to the Chair, and Mr. Wilson (United States) Vice-Chairman, began its study of the factors to be taken as a basis when calculating the irreducible component for overseas effectives.

* * *

The Special Committee set up to consider questions relating to Chemical, Incendiary and Bacteriological Warfare, meeting with M. Pilotti (Italy) in the Chair, prepared the replies to the technical questionnaire submitted to it by the Bureau of the Conference.

The Technical Committee of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure concluded its consideration of the documentation supplied by Germany, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, India, the Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia.

It is still considering the material received from South Africa, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Finland, New Zealand, and Portugal.

It also held a preliminary exchange of views on certain special questions laid before it by the Commission on National Defence Expenditure, dealing in particular with fluctuations in the purchasing power of the various currencies in their relation to publicity and the limitation of national defence expenditure.

It began the preparation of its report, which will probably be communicated to the full Commission on National Defence Expenditure towards the end of January.

2. SUMMARY OF THE FRENCH MEMORANDUM.

The French Memorandum opens with a statement that it is not intended to lead the work of the Conference into entirely new channels, but to permit it, after studying the Memorandum, to determine a system combining previous proposals, and in particular those of President Hoover.

The Memorandum points out that it has been proved that the reduction of armaments is necessarily bound up with security conditions existing or to be created. The aim of the Conference should be to strengthen defence by the reduction of forces of aggression, and to this end to work out a form of military organisation which in a given region and under specific political conditions would render aggression more difficult. The French Government considers it idle to attempt to solve all the questions involved by means of a universal plan. It therefore suggests that, apart from a general convention for the limitation, reduction and supervision of armaments, a special plan should be drawn up for Europe.

Chapter I. states that all the Powers should endorse the principles arising out of the Pact of Paris, and recognise that a war entered into in violation of this Pact is necessarily a matter of concern to all the Powers who, in the case of such a breach or threat of breach, would be called upon to take concerted action. Further, any breach of the Pact of Paris would involve prohibition of all economic and financial rela-

tions with the aggressor State, the Powers declaring their determination not to recognise any *fait accompli* resulting from a breach of an international undertaking.

Chapter II. states that the application of the principles laid down in the preceding Chapter should enable the States Members of the League of Nations to give full effect to their obligations under the Covenant and in particular under Article 16.

Chapter III. outlines a system for Europe which is, however, only practicable on condition that, if not all, at least a sufficient number of Powers, taking into account their size and geographical situation, adhere thereto. This Chapter contains both political and military provisions.

The first aim of the political provisions is to define the conditions in which each contracting State shall have the right to the co-operation of the others. This mutual assistance should take effect following on an attack or invasion, duly established by a Commission of diplomatic officials and military *attachés* appointed by the Council of the League. All contracting States must adhere to the General Act of Arbitration. Should any signatory State refuse to conform to the method of pacific settlement of disputes, or refuse to execute an arbitral or judicial settlement, or to take action upon the establishment by the League Council of the fact of violation of an international undertaking, the other party may bring the matter before the Council, which shall decide upon the measures to be taken. The contracting parties shall lend their co-operation in the execution of such decision. The decisions of the Council shall be taken by a majority vote.

The military provisions have a twofold object: firstly, in accordance with the principles of the Hoover proposals, to reduce the offensive character of national forces, and, secondly, to prepare for the rendering of mutual assistance in accordance with Articles 8 and 16 of the Covenant.

To achieve the first of these objects, the land defence forces of the Continental Powers of Europe would be standardised to a uniform type: that of a short service army with limited effectives. When estimating effectives the conditions peculiar to each State and in particular the inequalities and variations in the recruiting resources of the signatory Powers should, in conformity with Article 8 of the Covenant, be borne in mind. Likewise account should be taken of pre-regimental and military instruction received in political formations as

well as of the effectives of the home police forces.

National armies are to possess no powerful mobile material and especially no material such as would permit of attack upon permanent fortifications. On the other hand, each State shall permanently maintain at the disposal of the League, for purposes of common action, a limited number of specialised units consisting of relatively long service troops equipped with powerful material. In addition, each State shall maintain, under international supervision, stocks of the mobile land material forbidden to national armies, to be placed, should occasion arise, at the disposal of a contracting party on whose behalf collective action is taken.

Each contracting party shall regain in a case of legitimate defence the free use of the contingent maintained by it and of the stocks of material in its territory.

Provision is made for the progressive unification of war material and for regular and permanent supervision involving investigation at least once a year.

This programme will be achieved by stages in such a manner as to ensure that neither the forces nor the armaments expenditure of any State shall be increased save in exceptional circumstances duly justified and approved.

Chapter IV. deals with naval and overseas forces, which cannot be directly subjected to the continental system set out in Chapter III. Overseas forces are to be strictly limited and specialised in view of their peculiar duties.

Where naval matters are concerned, regional political agreements, such as, for example, a Mediterranean Pact, would promote the reduction of battle fleets. In any case, in accordance with the Hoover Plan, the major reductions should apply to those types of warships most useful for offensive purposes, and be achieved by means of qualitative reduction of given characteristics.

As regards quantitative reduction, the existing relation between armaments should be left intact; hence, subject to special arrangements for fleets of less than 100,000 tons aggregate tonnage, the uniform percentage of reduction should apply to the aggregate tonnages as declared in 1931.

The Plan further provides that each signatory State possessing naval forces should, when called upon by the League, supply the emergency assistance to which the State victim of aggression is entitled, such assistance to include a certain proportion of vessels in every category, that proportion being stipulated beforehand by the Convention.

Chapter V. deals with air armaments. The Plan recalls that on July 23rd the Conference provided for the complete prohibition of aerial bombardment and the correlative abolition of bombing aircraft, subject to security guarantees with regard to civil aviation. These results could be detailed within the framework of a regional system in which all the great military air powers of Europe, whether continental or not, would take part. There should be created a "European Air Transport Union"—an international body to direct and supervise public air transport and provide safeguards against the use of civil aircraft for military purposes.

Over and above placing specialised air units at the disposal of the League of Nations, the French Plan suggests the creation of an organically international air force composed, more especially, of the bombing craft forbidden to national forces, whose personnel should be recruited from volunteers from the different nations on the basis of quotas to be determined.

In conclusion it is emphasised that the several parts of this Plan form one indivisible whole.

3. SUMMARY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM PROPOSALS.

The proposals of the United Kingdom are primarily designed to meet the claim to equality of rights submitted by the German Government. While it is emphasised that the Treaty of Versailles is a binding document and can only be modified by common assent, it is urged that the disarmament imposed on Germany was clearly intended to be the prelude to a substantial measure of general disarmament which has yet to be effected.

The proposals begin with the suggestion that all European States should solemnly affirm that they will not in any circumstances attempt to solve any present or future differences between them by resort to force, and it is emphasised in this connection that acknowledgment of the moral right to parity of treatment put forward by Germany entails upon Germany along with others the acceptance of a corresponding obligation not to resort to force. It is then urged that the claims of Germany to equality should be met so far as they do not involve measures of re-armament. The limitations on the armaments of Germany should be contained in the same Disarmament Convention as that defining the limitations of the armaments of other nations; they should last for the same period and be subject to the same methods of revision. In the new Disarmament Convention, the principle should be embodied that the kinds

of arms permitted to other countries should not be prohibited to Germany. In other words, the principle of qualitative equality should be acknowledged.

This refers to the kinds of arms and not to the amounts; this latter question must be separately and subsequently treated. By what means and by what stages the principle of qualitative equality could be applied must be the subject of detailed discussions in which it is essential that Germany should join. In the meantime the Government of the United Kingdom emphasises two points: First, the object of the Disarmament Conference is to bring about the maximum of positive disarmament that can be generally agreed—not to authorise in the name of equality the increase of armed strength. Secondly, the full realisation in practice of the principle of equality cannot be achieved all at once.

The immediate task of the Disarmament Conference is to settle the programme of the first stage and, if possible, establish the main outlines of the second stage. Certain methods are suggested for application in the first stage. The principle of according to Germany equality of rights demands that Germany should be permitted to build ships of a type similar to that upon which the great naval powers finally agree. Exhaustive investigation has shown that the arbitrary figure of 10,000 tons as the limit of a capital ship would fail to command general acceptance. The principle, however, that the reorganisation of Germany's fighting forces must not conflict with the limitation and reduction of armaments requires that any construction undertaken by Germany should not increase the total tonnage in any category to which her navy is at present restricted. The Government of the United Kingdom have already expressed their willingness to limit cruisers to vessels of 7,000 tons mounting 6-inch guns, a limit closely approximating to the limit now imposed upon Germany. The Government urge also that the best way of meeting Germany's claims to equality in regard to submarines would be to consent to their abolition.

The Government propose that all tanks above a given weight should be abolished, and that the maximum weight should be fixed with a view to prohibiting tanks suitable for offensive employment. The admission of equal treatment would make it impossible to deny, in principle, to Germany the right to possess a limited number of such weapons.

The Government represent that the best way to accord Germany equality of treatment in

regard to mobile land guns is to press for a general reduction in their size. The maximum calibre of large mobile guns permitted to Germany is 105 mm., a figure intended to limit them to a type suitable for defence operations.

The Government are prepared to discuss the ultimate abolition by international agreement of military and naval aircraft and of bombing from the air, combined with an effective international control of civil aviation. It suggests, as an immediate practical measure of disarmament, the reduction of the air forces of the leading Powers to the level of those of the United Kingdom, a cut of one-third in the air forces of the world thus reduced, and a limitation of the unladen weight of military aircraft to the lowest figure on which general agreement can be obtained. It is felt that Germany, should this programme be carried into effect, might not unreasonably be asked to refrain from making any claim to possess military or naval aircraft.

The admission of Germany's claim to equality of treatment and freedom in the matter of her fighting forces or effectives should be governed by respect for the principle of limitation and reduction, that is to say, if Germany wishes, for instance, to be free from the prohibition against compulsory military service, the numbers of men annually compulsorily given a militia training must be deducted, at a ratio to be agreed on, from the numbers of her long-service troops. Again, the reduction of the term of service of these long-service troops from twelve to six years, if agreed to, would be conditional on the number of long-service reserves not being augmented; that is, in that case, the number of long-service troops with the colours must then be reduced from 100,000 to 50,000. Elaborate calculations as to the proper ratios would be required but the guiding principle must remain, that is to say, reorganisation of German forces must not involve an increase of Germany's powers of military aggression.

The Government of the United Kingdom are favourably impressed by the Hoover proposals in regard to military effectives, and are prepared to accept them in principle as constituting a basis for discussion. They agree that there shall be set up a Permanent Disarmament Commission, as suggested in the Draft Disarmament Convention, with such extension of its powers as may be deemed necessary by the Disarmament Conference for an effective application of the Convention. It urges that such supervision must be subject to agreed conditions accepted by all States represented at Geneva.

4. THE ARMAMENTS TRUCE.

As will be remembered, on July 23rd the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments recommended to the Governments the renewal for a period of four months from November 1st, 1932, of the Truce proposed in the Assembly resolution of September 29th, 1931.

On November 3rd, at a meeting of the Bureau of the Conference, the President, Mr. Henderson, announced that no Government had opposed the renewal of the Truce, and that it had been accepted by the following States: Afghanistan, South Africa, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa-Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The President added that a certain number of Governments had subjected their acceptance to reciprocity, and that other replies reaffirmed the interpretations and observations submitted on the subject in 1931. These, however, seemed to be in harmony with the resolution and report adopted by the Twelfth Assembly.

Following the 1931 precedent, the President proposed to consider the Armaments Truce as renewed in the conditions indicated in the resolution and report adopted by the Assembly of September, 1931, for four months as from November 1st, by the Governments taking part in the Conference.

The French representative, M. Massigli, while raising no objection to this proposal, recalled that his Government had only accepted the Truce on condition that it was observed by the countries bordering on France. He believed that one at least of these countries had not yet replied; hence, while accepting the Truce, he must draw attention to the situation which this might bring about.

After noting the French delegate's statement, the Bureau adopted the procedure recommended by the President.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS: REGISTRATION OF TREATIES.

The Treaties and Conventions registered with the League of Nations during November, 1932, include:

A Treaty of conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration between Norway and Portugal (Lisbon, July 26th, 1930), presented by Portugal;

A Treaty of friendship, commerce and navi-

gation, as amended by the Protocol of January 30th, 1931, between Norway and Persia (Paris, May 8th, 1930), presented by Norway;

A Convention on extradition and judicial assistance in penal matters between Czechoslovakia and Sweden (Prague, November 17th, 1931), presented by Czechoslovakia;

A Veterinary Convention between Belgium and Poland (Brussels, December 18th, 1930), presented by Poland.

IV.—MEETING OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE MONETARY AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCE.

The Preparatory Commission for the Monetary and Economic Conference held its first session, under the chairmanship of M. Trip (Netherlands), from October 31st to November 9th.

It will be remembered that one of the tasks of the Lausanne Conference was to decide upon measures to remedy the economic and financial difficulties which had provoked, or were contributing to prolong, the present world crisis. In this connection the Conference stressed the necessity of restoring currencies to a healthy

basis, thereby making it possible to abolish measures of exchange control and to remove transfer difficulties. It also drew attention to the vital need of facilitating the revival of international trade.

To achieve these ends the Lausanne Conference invited the League to summon a monetary and economic conference, and decided to entrust to a commission of qualified experts the preliminary examination of a number of questions to be included on the agenda of the Conference. These questions are:

(a) In the financial field—monetary and credit policy, exchange difficulties, price-levels, movement of capital;

(b) In the economic field—improved conditions of production and trade interchanges, with particular attention to tariff policy, import and export prohibitions and restrictions, quotas and other barriers to trade, producers' agreements.

In accordance with the decision of the Lausanne Conference and the Council's instructions, the Preparatory Commission is composed as follows: two experts—one financial and one economic—appointed by each of the Governments of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States; one expert appointed by the Government of Norway, three financial and three economic experts appointed by the Council, and two financial experts by the Bank for International Settlements.

In response to the invitation of the Lausanne Conference, the Council set up an Organising Committee to take practical steps for preparing and convening the Monetary and Economic Conference. This Committee, of which Sir John Simon is President, includes representatives of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway, and the United States.

At the suggestion of the Organising Committee, the Commission associated three representatives from the International Labour Organisation and one from the International Institute of Agriculture, with that part of its work for which these persons are particularly competent.

The Preparatory Commission's task was a preliminary examination of the questions indicated by the Lausanne Conference, and the drafting of an annotated agenda for the Monetary and Economic Conference. The Commission split up into separate economic and financial committees, under the chairmanship of M. van Langenhove (Belgium) and Professor Beneduce (Italy) respectively. It became apparent during the discussions that the Commission should also, if possible, aim at drafting proposals for submission to the Conference. The Commission explored the problems with which the Monetary and Economic Conference should deal, with a view to defining them and to analysing the means by which they might best be solved by international action. After a preliminary exchange of views which went a long way towards understanding and agreement on both these matters, the Commission adjourned in

order to permit its members to continue in their own countries the studies and consultations considered essential to the progress of its work. In the meantime the President was asked to ensure the practical correlation of the work. Positive proposals would be elaborated at the following session of the Commission.

On November 22nd the Organising Committee of the Council noted the work of the Preparatory Commission. Its President, Sir John Simon, addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, informing him that the Organising Committee was anxious that the Monetary and Economic Conference should be convened at as early a date as would be compatible with the successful execution of the task of the Preparatory Commission, and with the necessary interval between the despatch of the draft agenda to States and the actual meeting of the Conference. The Organising Committee hoped that it might be possible for the Preparatory Commission to submit its annotated draft agenda to the Committee at its forthcoming meeting to be held in the latter part of January, 1933, when it proposed to fix the date for the convocation of the Conference. If by that time the Commission had not been able to complete the annotation of the agenda, or if owing to any subsequent circumstances it desired to supplement this, it could continue its work, provided, however, that the major problems were included in the list of points to be sent out with the letter of convocation.

The Preparatory Commission will meet in second session on January 9th, 1933. The first session was attended by the following: M. Francqui and M. van Langenhove (Belgium), M. Rist and M. Parmentier (France), M. Vocke and M. Posse (Germany), M. Beneduce and M. Tassarini (Italy), M. Kawai and M. Tsuchida (Japan), Sir Frederick Leith-Ross and Mr. Philipps (United Kingdom), Mr. May and Mr. Williams (United States), M. Jahn (Norway), MM. Dvoracek (Czechoslovak), Ryti (Finnish), de Nickl (Hungarian), Baranski (Polish), and Musy (Swiss), experts appointed by the Council,* M. Trip (Netherlands) and Mr. Fraser (United States), experts appointed by the Bank for International Settlements; M. Weigert (German), M. Oersted (Danish), and M. Jouhaux (France) on behalf of the International Labour Organisation, and M. de Michelis (Italian) for the International Institute of Agriculture.

* The sixth expert appointed by the Council, M. Prebisch (Argentine), was unable to be present.

V.—TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

Economic and Financial Organisation.

1. DRAFT MONETARY NORMALISATION FUND.

The report of the Committee of Experts, set up by the Council at the request of the Commission of Inquiry for European Union, to undertake a "detailed and thorough examination of the monetary normalisation fund scheme mentioned in the resolutions of the Stresa Conference," has been communicated to the States Members of the League.

This report, as the Committee itself points out, does not contain the detailed scheme for which it had been asked, but its mere outline, laying down certain general principles which should govern the future working of the fund.

The experts considered that in view of the uncertainty of the present situation it was impossible, from the technical point of view, to do otherwise.

The object of the fund will be to promote a return to normal monetary conditions in Central and Eastern Europe. Its utilisation will be contemplated only in cases where adequate assurance is given by the countries concerned that they will abolish, at the earliest possible date, restrictions on exchange transactions and maintain or re-establish monetary stability.

The action of the Fund will, in principle, take the form of credits for the purpose of providing the Bank of issue with a second line of reserves.

In case of need the Fund may also make advances, the proceeds of which will serve to strengthen the central bank.

The duration of these operations will not exceed two years; they may, however, be renewed, provided their total duration does not exceed three years.

The necessary guarantees will be required.

The amount of the Fund has not been decided upon. A part will be paid in cash. The balance will be called up only in case of need.

The Governments will participate in the Fund in a proportion to be established.

The management of the Fund will be based upon two principles:

(a) The actual handling of the Fund should, in any case, be entrusted to the Bank for International Settlements;

(b) Contact should, in any case, be established and maintained between the Bank for International Settlements and the Financial Committee of the League.

The Fund will collect interest and commission at a suitable rate. The sums thus collected will, after deducting expenses, be placed to the reserve.

The Monetary Normalisation Fund will remain in operation for a period of five years as from its actual constitution. No commitments falling due after the expiry of the third year following the termination of the above-mentioned period of operation will be entered into under this Fund. The assets will be distributed among the subscribers *pro rata* to their subscriptions.

* * *

The Committee of Experts recalls in its Report that the Stresa Conference, when suggesting the establishment of a Monetary Normalisation Fund, did not contemplate its immediate operation. On the contrary, it stressed the necessity for the previous fulfilment of certain essential conditions by the countries which might have recourse to the Fund. Chief among these conditions were: the readjustment of the balance of payments, the re-establishment on sound bases of their entire national economy, the final restoration of budgetary equilibrium, and the adjustment, so far as might be necessary, of foreign debts by means of negotiations with the creditors.

The Monetary Normalisation Fund will only be operated in the final stages of financial recovery in any given country; indeed, it would constitute but one of the means of ensuring this, and operations of this kind have been carried out in the past with the help of credits granted by central or commercial banks, long term loans, and in various other ways. The establishment a few years ago of the Bank for International Settlements has introduced further facilities in this domain.

The Committee of Experts feels that in view of the present insecurity of monetary systems, and of the fact that requests for assistance may be made simultaneously by several countries, it is unlikely that these various methods, which will doubtless be called upon to play their part, will prove adequate. Hence the interest of the new scheme conceived at Stresa.

The Committee of Experts, which met from October 26th to November 1st, 1932, with M. Bachmann, President of the Swiss National Bank, in the Chair, also included M. Bruins, Royal Commissioner of the Netherlands Bank; M. Dayras, Inspector of Finance, Commissioner of the French Governments at the State Bank of Morocco; M. Di Nola, Director-General of the Istituto Italiano di Credito Fondiario; Sir Cecil Kisch, Financial Secretary, India Office, London; M. Mlynarski, Professor in the School of Advanced Commercial Studies, Warsaw,

former Vice-Governor of the Bank of Poland ; M. Momchloff, Governor of the National Bank of Bulgaria ; M. Muller, Director of the Reichsbank ; M. Protitch, Director of the National Bank of Yugoslavia ; and M. Van Zeeland, Director of the National Bank of Belgium.

2. CUSTOMS NOMENCLATURE.

The draft standard Customs Nomenclature drawn up by the Sub-Committee of Experts * has been communicated to the Governments, with its accompanying notes and commentaries. The object of the International Economic Conference in 1927 in recommending this work was to introduce order, clearness, and above all simplicity and uniformity into the nomenclature of customs tariffs.

The great difference between the nomenclature of the various Customs tariffs arises on the one hand from the particular economic structure of each country, which must naturally be reflected in its tariff, and on the other from the diversity of the formal and systematic criteria on the basis of which products are arranged in categories and items. Thus the items of the present Customs tariffs rarely coincide. Even the definitions of products frequently differ. Hence consultation of the tariffs leads to perpetual misunderstanding and uncertainty, while their application frequently involves disputes between Customs authorities and traders.

The draft Customs nomenclature proposed by the Sub-Committee of Experts classified goods under eighty-six chapters, grouped in twenty-one sections. As regards the distribution of goods within the chapters, origin, processes of manufacture, degree of workmanship, and economic importance are each taken into account either separately or together. In some cases the experts have taken into consideration the nature of the packing (for instance, for the subdivision for preserved vegetables, meat, fish, etc.), and, in exceptional cases, destination ; thus, the chapter relating to "fertilisers" includes

products which may be put to other uses, but are principally or normally used as fertilisers.

The draft nomenclature contains main or basic items, secondary items, and sometimes tertiary or quaternary items.

The Sub-Committee added that the principal items only should be compulsory, the others being optional, with the reservation, however, that States desiring to subdivide the basic items would be required to accept the subdivisions provided for in the draft.

The system thus envisaged would leave countries free to draw up a tariff suited to their own economic and fiscal requirements, but such an adjustment of the League draft to the special requirements of the different countries—effected by expanding and contracting the sub-items—would in no way alter the structure of the standard nomenclature. Goods would everywhere be classified in accordance with the same principles ; the contents of each heading would always be defined in a precise and identical manner, and the same terms be used everywhere for the same products.

The unification of customs nomenclature would in fact mean the unification of customs terminology, thus removing any grounds for uncertainty and ambiguity in interpreting tariffs.

In communicating the draft to the Governments the Secretary-General draws attention to the procedure envisaged for the entry into force of a standard customs nomenclature : consultation between the industrial and commercial circles affected, following which each Government will publish the observations made and which it considers worthy of retention ; the observations so collected will be examined by the Committee of Experts, which will, if necessary, revise the draft nomenclature in order to render it acceptable to all States.

The Governments were requested to forward their observations on the draft nomenclature before July 1st, 1932.

VI.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

1. THE EDUCATIONAL CINEMATOGRAPH.

The Governing Body and Permanent Executive Committee of the International Educational Cinematograph Institute met at Rome towards the end of October and reviewed the Institute's activity.†

This work, the value of which was emphasised

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 6, page 192.

† The Executive Committee of the Institute met before and after the session of the Governing Body, the first meeting being to prepare the Governing Body's work, the second to decide upon the provisions necessary for the application of its resolutions.

by the Governing Body, has already shown practical results in various fields. The Institute has drawn up an encyclopædia of the cinematograph, to be completed and published shortly, and, with a view to promoting the adoption of the Protocol on the circulation of films of an educational character, has prepared a system for its application, to be submitted to the Governments for approval at the same time as the draft protocol revised by the Assembly.‡

‡ See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 290.

The Governing Body laid down the broad lines of the Institute's future programme. It decided to accept the co-operation which certain groups of film producers are prepared to afford the League in making its work known. An Advisory and Technical Committee will be set up for this purpose and will include representatives of the various groups of producers concerned. While at the League's disposal, it will be attached to the Institute, by which it is to be set up and convened.

The Governing Body in principle approved the convening, under the Institute's auspices, of an international congress on education through the cinema. The object of this congress will be to study the services which the cinema can render both as regards the teaching of scientific subjects proper, the general education of young people, and their vocational guidance and training. Representatives of the teaching world, delegates of national institutions or commissions dealing with the educational aspects of the cinema, and film producers will have an opportunity of meeting there.

The Governing Body dealt during its session with various other questions on the Institute's agenda, notably those regarding authors'

scenario rights, recreational films for children, folk-lore films, "*droit moral*" in scenario matters, and the rôle of the cinema in the utilisation of workers' spare time. It instructed the Institute to continue its studies and researches on these various matters.

2. INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF STUDENTS.

Summoned by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, the international students' organisations held their fifth annual meeting at Paris.

The purpose of this meeting was to consider certain questions concerning the moral and material life of students, and to carry on the work for moral disarmament recently undertaken by students' organisations.

The meeting also studied the means of distributing international students' identity cards.

The Organisations represented were: The International Federation of Students, the International Student Service, the International Federation of University Women, the World's Student Christian Federation, the International University Federation of League of Nations Societies, Pax Romana, and the World Union of Jewish Students.

VII.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

1. MEETING OF THE MANDATES COMMISSION.

The twenty-second session of the Permanent Mandates Commission opened in Geneva on November 3rd. In view of the fact that one session only was to be held during 1932, the Commission continued its work into December.

An account of the work performed by the Commission at this session will be published in the forthcoming number of the *Monthly Summary*.

2. FRONTIER BETWEEN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

The Council, at its meeting of November 25th, at which were present Noury Pacha, representative of Iraq and the President of the Mandates Commission, finally adopted the frontier line between Iraq and Syria as delineated by the Commission of Inquiry, and accepted by the Council on October 3rd last.*

It will be remembered that on that date the Council, before taking a decision, asked the Mandates Commission to give at the earliest possible date its opinion from the point of view of the interests of the territories concerned.

The Mandates Commission, whose session

opened on November 3rd, communicated its conclusions to the Council, stating that "the report of the Commission of Inquiry—the only material it has had on which to form a judgment—does not appear to it to contain any information which would justify it in asserting that the line of the proposed frontier is not in the interests of the territories affected."

At the Council meeting the Italian representative, Baron Aloisi, emphasised that the Mandates Commission had done everything in its power to give an enlightening opinion concerning the line suggested by the Commission of Inquiry. It had at the same time felt obliged to inform the Council that, although it had been furnished with all the documentation on the subject, it could not be expected to express a definite opinion in the circumstances, thus assuming a responsibility that could only fall upon the Commission of Inquiry, which had had the benefit of access to direct sources of information. Baron Aloisi pointed out that the Council should, in similar cases, place the Permanent Mandates Commission in a position to be able to express a definite opinion, since only thus could it fulfil the objects for which it had been set up by the Covenant,

* See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XII, No. 10, page 291.

3. DANZIG.

(1) *Introduction of the Zloty as the sole means of Payment on the Railways in the Territory of the Free City; Question of "Direct Action."*

M. Helmer Rosting, acting League High Commissioner at Danzig, had laid before the Council a request from the Free City that the promulgation of the Polish Decree, enacting that the Zloty should be introduced as the sole means of payment on Polish railways in Danzig territory as from December 1st, should be considered a case of "direct action."*

At its meeting of November 23rd the Council, on the proposal of its rapporteur, the United Kingdom representative, instructed the Spanish and Norwegian representatives to join with him in seeking a solution. At the Council meeting of November 25th the rapporteur explained the state of the negotiations. The representative of the Free City of Danzig had, he said, pointed out that the Polish Government's Decree was contrary to Poland's treaty obligations, and constituted a case of "direct action." The Polish representative justified the promulgation of the Decree on practical grounds, since the Danzig railways were administered by the Polish authorities. The Polish Government, which was anxious that Polish currency should be used, considered that this decision in no way constituted a case of "direct action."

The rapporteur further stated that he and his two colleagues had drawn up a draft arrangement on which, however, agreement had not yet been reached. In view of the imminent entry into force of the Decree it was indispensable that a committee of jurists should be consulted.

Before this Committee had time to meet the Council learned, at its meeting of November 28th, that the High Commissioner asked it to withdraw the Free City's request from its agenda.

The High Commissioner explained in his letter to the Council that the question had been settled by an agreement signed on November 26th by M. Beck, Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, and M. Ziehm, President of the Senate of the Free City of Danzig.†

The rapporteur, after expressing satisfaction at the conciliatory efforts made by the parties concerned, congratulated the High Commissioner, whose indefatigable industry and diplomatic skill had so largely contributed to this result.

He further recalled that the draft agreement submitted to the parties, rendered unnecessary by the direct agreement of November 26th, had proposed the setting up of a committee of three Members of the Council to study revision of the procedure relating to "direct action." He asked the Council to retain and adopt this proposal.

The Council, in agreement with this view, asked its President to set up the Committee, instructing it to submit a report in January next, after hearing the parties.

(2) *Appointment of the League High Commissioner at Danzig.*

At its meeting on November 28th the Council, on the proposal of the United Kingdom representative, and at the request of the Polish and Danzig Governments, decided to extend the appointment of M. Helmer Rosting, Acting High Commissioner of the League of Nations at Danzig, until February 1st, 1933.

VIII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

On November 18th the Japanese representative on the Council forwarded to the Secretary-General his Government's observations on the report of the Commission of Inquiry set up under the resolution of December 10th, 1931.‡ An analysis of this document is annexed to this number of the *Monthly Summary*.

In conformity with its resolution of September 24th, the Council met on November 21st to consider the Commission of Inquiry's report.

* See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 156.

† See *Monthly Summary*, Vol. XI., No. 12, page 334.

The President, Mr. de Valera, paid a tribute to Lord Lytton and the other members of the Commission of Inquiry—who, in response to the Council's invitation, were present in Geneva—for the remarkable way in which they had carried out their task. He added that the work done by the Commission constituted a most valuable precedent. Turning to the question of procedure, he recalled that the Council had, on February 19th, laid the Sino-Japanese

‡ This Agreement also settled the following points in dispute: treatment of Polish nationals and other persons of Polish origin or language in Danzig territory; school charges borne by the Polish railway administration; sale of certain Polish newspapers in the territory of the Free City, and sale of certain Danzig newspapers in Polish territory.

dispute before the Assembly, in conformity with Article 15, paragraph 9, of the Covenant, and noted that the measures adopted with a view to obtaining the necessary information for consideration of the dispute were being carried out. The Assembly had, on March 11th, decided to set up a Committee of nineteen members, and had asked the Council to communicate to this Committee, with any observations, the documentation which it might see fit to forward to the Assembly.

The Japanese representative, M. Matsuoka, submitted a certain number of observations on the report, supplementing those already forwarded by his Government. He first emphasised the fact that his country, while fully appreciating the efforts and remarkable work of the Commission of Inquiry, agreed with passages and whole sections of the report; this did not, however, appear so full or so proper in many of its deductions and conclusions as would have been a document produced as a result of a longer study of the problem. In particular, the report took a somewhat optimistic and hopeful view of the situation in China which Japan was unable to share. Drawing attention to the existence of the boycott system in China, he asked why, when it assumed an "official or semi-official character," it should not be condemned and outlawed by the League.

After denouncing the anti-Japanese campaign systematically carried out in Manchuria, he opposed the view that the Japanese military operations of September 18th and 19th, 1931, could not be considered as measures of legitimate self defence. He explained that his country had not referred the Manchurian question to the League because Japanese national feeling would not have permitted of intervention from abroad in the matter, and that the position of Japanese nationals, including Koreans, in Manchuria would have been seriously undermined by an appeal of this kind. "We agree entirely with the Commission," he said, "in their statement that the return of Manchuria to the *status quo ante* would be an unsatisfactory solution. But we entirely disagree with the statement that 'the maintenance and recognition of the present régime would be equally unsatisfactory.' The establishment of the State of Manchukuo appears to us to be the only solution possible."

After stating that the "new State" did not owe its organisation to Japanese initiative, he expressed every hope for the future of Manchukuo. He concluded:

"It is unjust to make Japan responsible for what has happened in Manchuria. We did not

seek the change. Had China, as a whole, or even Manchuria alone, been properly governed, had the rights and interests and the lives of the Japanese people been free from deliberately destructive efforts, there would have been no change. We acted spontaneously in self-defence; and when we acted the independence movement developed spontaneously. . . .

We have violated neither the Covenant of the League nor the Nine-Power Treaty nor the Pact of Paris.

I would ask the Council to look at the record of Japan since she opened her doors, eighty years ago, to foreign intercourse. For three hundred years—a longer record than any nation in the world—we had had no foreign war. Subsequently we had occasion to participate in several. Have we sought in these wars anything but our own security from the menace of others? No! On the other hand, for how many years has the condition of China been a menace to the peace of the world, and how long will it continue to be?

The policy, the hope, the determination of my country is the maintenance of peace. We want war with no nation. We want no more territory. We are no aggressors. We desire deeply and earnestly the welfare of our great neighbour.

For decades the unhappy condition of China has been a dangerous influence, while the policies of Japan have been the stabilising and protective influence in the Far East; the facts of history bear this out. It would be difficult for the Japanese nation to understand the attitude of Western Powers if they should accuse us of the contrary."

The Chinese representative, M. Wellington Koo, after praising the Commission of Inquiry's work, emphasised that China was passing through an inevitable period of uncertainty, the result of its transformation from an Empire four thousand years' old into a modern democracy. One of the greatest difficulties met with by China in its task of internal unification and reconstruction was Japan's repeated attempts to prevent the accomplishment of this task. After denouncing Japan's "traditional policy of expansion," he stated that the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods was no more than a measure of legitimate self-defence. Chinese nationalism was not really based on anti-foreign feeling; there did, however, exist a national sentiment provoked by Japan's traditional policy aiming at domination and conquest of China.

After quoting the passages of the Commission of Inquiry's report relating to the events of September 18th and 19th, 1931, at Mukden, he stated that Japan had by force separated thirty million Chinese from their fellow countrymen.

He was in agreement with one of the principles stated by the Commission of Inquiry—

that any solution must be in conformity with the provisions of the Covenant of the League, the Pact of Paris, and the Washington Nine-Power Pact. He concluded :

"The time has now come for prompt and effective action by the League. Further hesitation will not only entail more bloodshed and suffering to the thirty million Chinese people in Manchuria, but will perhaps irretrievably shake the general confidence in the efficacy of this great institution of peace. On October 24th, 1931, M. Briand, the distinguished apostle of peace, whose memory we all cherish, said, when presiding over the discussions of the same Sino-Japanese question in the Council, that 'to prolong this situation would be to perpetuate a state of anxiety which has already lasted too long.' More than a year has since elapsed, and this delay has meant to China tens of thousands more of innocent lives lost, and literally billions of dollars more of property destroyed in consequence of the continued aggravation of the whole situation by Japan through her extended military operations in Manchuria, Shanghai, and Tientsin. It has brought us to a point at which there is not only a danger to China's existence, but also a challenge to the League itself. It is only by a speedy and effective settlement of this conflict, in conformity with the principles of justice and right clearly provided in the international instruments I have more than once referred to, that China hopes to have her wrong redressed and the instruments of world peace safeguarded."

On November 23rd and 24th the Council heard fresh statements by the Chinese and Japanese representatives.

On November 25th, Lord Lytton, President of the Commission of Inquiry, stated to the Council on behalf of his colleagues that the Commission had nothing to add to its report. The President emphasised that the Council, in spite of the fact that the Sino-Japanese dispute had been referred to the Assembly in conformity with Article 14, paragraph 9, of the Covenant, had the right to discuss a report asked for under Article 11. For practical reasons, however, he proposed immediately to refer the matter to the extraordinary Assembly, since any Members of the Council who, like himself, might wish to submit observations on the Commission's report, would be able to do so before that body.

He added that as few elements in the statements made by the Chinese and Japanese representatives justified any confidence in a satisfactory and speedy settlement of the dispute, the Council was not in a position to submit recommendations or suggestions likely to be of assistance to the Assembly. In conclusion, he appealed to the parties henceforth to direct their attention to the positive side of the question, and carefully to consider what they could do to assist the League in seeking a solution.

M. Matsuoka, speaking in his individual capacity, felt that the Assembly, to whom the question was submitted under Article 15, should first exhaust all possible means of reaching a conciliatory solution. This being the case, he saw no difference between considering the matter under Article 11 and Article 15, paragraph 3, of the Covenant. It was useless to seek a solution with which both parties were not in agreement. The League could not neglect the wishes of either party, nor fail to obtain the full consent of both. For his part he could not agree to any solution which failed to fulfil these conditions.

Recalling that Japan had earlier submitted a reservation regarding the application of Article 15, he added that he could not accept the President's proposal before referring the matter to his Government.

M. Wellington Koo supported the President's proposal. China would accept any solution based on those principles which all had admitted; since the Japanese delegate had, however, stated that settlement could only be reached on the basis of recognition of Manchukuo, he must state forthwith that this proposal was unacceptable to China.

On November 28th, M. Matsuoka announced that since his Government maintained the reservation which he had submitted regarding Article 15 of the Covenant, he must abstain from voting. He added that the opinion which he had expressed on this subject at the Council meeting of November 25th was confirmed by his Government.

The Council, after noting this declaration, decided to forward to the Extraordinary Assembly the report of the Commission of Inquiry, the written observations of the Japanese Government on the report, and the minutes of its meetings.

The President again thanked the Chairman and members of the Commission of Inquiry for coming to Geneva in order to co-operate with the Council. He added that should the Assembly, at the request of one of its members, wish for further information or explanations on the report, it might recall the Commission by means of a special resolution.

M. Matsuoka stated that the Commission had, in his opinion, ceased to exist from the moment when it had handed in its report. He submitted a reservation, of which note was duly taken, regarding the President's statement.

After the Council decision, M. Hymans, President of the Extraordinary Assembly,

convened the Committee of Nineteen for December 1st, and the Assembly for December 6th.

2. DISPUTE BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY.

On November 5th the Chairman of the Committee of Three, set up by the Council to follow the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay, heard from the Chairman of the Committee of Neutrals at Washington that Bolivia and Paraguay had accepted the opening of direct negotiations, under the auspices of the Committee of Neutrals, "for the termination of hostilities and to arrange for arbitral settlement of the dispute."

The Committee of the Council, meeting on November 8th, replied on the 9th to the Committee of Neutrals:

"We are particularly glad to hear that the direct negotiations under the auspices of your Committee have begun and are proceeding normally. At the same time, we cannot but be seriously concerned at the continuation of war-like action in the Chaco, in spite of all efforts to the contrary, and we trust that hostilities will now be suspended definitely, and that both parties will give formal assurances that they will not proceed during such suspension to any military preparations or other action which might prejudice the progress of the negotiations."

As hostilities nevertheless continued in the Chaco, the Council Committee met again on November 23rd and 24th. At the Council meeting of November 25th the President, Mr. de Valera, stated that the direct negotiations opened at Washington had not made sufficient progress to guarantee the immediate cessation of hostilities.

In order to strengthen the action of the Committee of Neutrals and to arrive as soon as possible at a peaceful settlement of the dispute, he proposed the despatch of two telegrams, the first to the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay, the second to the Chairman of the Committee of Neutrals.

The first of these telegrams read as follows:

"It is the duty of Bolivia and Paraguay, as Members of the League, to put an immediate stop to the fighting which continues in the Chaco. The Council will welcome the news that this has been done. The Council is aware that on September 22nd last the Commission of Neutrals in Washington proposed that hostilities should be terminated, and offered to send military representatives to the Chaco to observe the execution of this proposal. The Council calls on both parties to accept this proposal without delay, and to give to the proposed Military Commission the facilities it will require to enable it to aid in making such provisional arrangements as, without prejudice to the ultimate settlement of the dispute, will terminate the present fighting

and remove the danger of renewed military activities.

The Council is informed that under the auspices of the Commission of Neutrals the two Governments are in direct negotiation for an arbitral settlement of the dispute. The Council urges more rapid progress in this negotiation, and the fulfilment by both parties of their obligations under Article 12 of the Covenant."

The second telegram first stressed the Council's obligations in the matter of the preservation of peace, and went on to express the Council's concern at the prolongation, and even intensification, of the fighting in the Chaco. It quoted in full the appeal sent to Bolivia and Paraguay, and suggested that the proposed military commission should be constituted immediately and should proceed to carry out its duties forthwith.

When reading this document to the Council the President emphasised that the telegram addressed to Bolivia and Paraguay was based on the principles of the League Covenant, by which both parties were bound, and was also in harmony with the principles of the Pact of Paris, with the ideals underlying various legal instruments concluded at Pan-American Conferences, and with the views set out in the draft South American Pact of Non-Aggression and Conciliation recently proposed by the Argentine Government.

In conclusion, he drew the Council's attention to a question to which the Committee of Three attached particular importance. One of the difficulties which appeared to stand in the way of the cessation of hostilities was the fear, on both sides, of possible re-armament on the part of the adversary. Neither of the parties to the dispute produced arms, munitions and implements of war, so that any increase in their military power depended on imports from abroad.

The President, in the name of the Committee, drew the attention of the Governments to this point.

M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia) and M. Caballero y Bedoya (Paraguay) announced that they would inform their Governments of the Council's views on the subject.

The Bolivian representative hoped that the negotiations undertaken at Washington, in which his Government was anxious to co-operate by every means in its power, would be crowned with success.

The Paraguayan representative said that his country remained ready to submit the whole dispute to arbitral or judicial procedure.

The Council authorised its President to despatch the telegrams.

Paraguay replied on November 28th, stating that, anxious for the immediate cessation of hostilities in the Chaco, "provided she obtains guarantees against further Bolivian aggression against her legitimate inheritance," it considered that the League could exercise a pacific influence "by means of investigation which would enable the country responsible for the conflict to be determined with a view to the application of the sanctions provided for in the Covenant."

On December 1st, Bolivia announced that it was prepared "to suspend hostilities immediately. But Paraguay begins," went on the telegram, "by assuming the territory under dispute to be her legitimate inheritance and wishes to impose its material abandonment on Bolivia before the neutrals, a condition which is unacceptable in law. Furthermore, Bolivia is even now the country suffering aggression, and it is not the party which is defending itself which should cease hostilities. We inform the League that Bolivia duly accepts proposed Commission with the sole modification that it should be a civil commission presided over by an American military officer of high rank. Bolivia is continuing proceedings before the neutrals."

3. REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FROM LIBERIA.

The Council dealt at its meeting of November 23rd with the request for assistance submitted by the Liberian Government.*

The rapporteur to the Council, the Polish representative, recalled that in October last the Council had thought that the Finance Corporation of America would send representatives to Geneva in November, and that negotiations with the Liberian Government could shortly be begun there with the co-operation of the Financial Organisation of the League and of M. Lighthart, one of the three experts who had visited Liberia in 1931.†

The Liberian Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury had accordingly remained in Europe awaiting the arrival of the American representatives. The Finance Corporation of America had, however, considered that before opening negotiations it must obtain information locally as to the actual situation in Liberia, and had sent its Vice-President, Mr. Lyle, to Monrovia, due to arrive there on December 11th.

In these conditions the negotiations contemplated by the Council cannot take place

until next year. The Council nevertheless expressed the hope that the Finance Corporation of America would not refuse its co-operation and would promote the working of the plan of assistance.

The Council also specified that the principal financial negotiations would take place in Geneva in the spring of 1933.

Mr. Grimes (Liberia) emphasised that any delay in the negotiations was no fault of the Liberian Government. He recalled that the Council had at its meeting of October 12th expressed regret that the representatives of the Finance Corporation of America and the Firestone Plantations Company had not come to Geneva to hold conversations. He further pointed out that the United States representative had let it be understood that the American representatives might arrive during November.

Meanwhile, however, the financial situation in Liberia had become considerably more serious. As a result of the crisis, revenue had dropped to a marked extent. Payment of interest and the amortisation of the loan had, nevertheless, been regularly continued. Fulfilment of these financial obligations represented the following percentages of the total State revenue: 20% in 1928, 26% in 1929, 32% in 1930 and 54% in 1931, while the percentage absorbed in 1932 was even higher. Liberia's general revenue was thus constantly drained of considerable sums. In spite of salary reductions officials could no longer be paid, and much suffering has been occasioned among the population.

Mr. Grimes explained that the Liberian Government had several times appealed vainly to the Finance Corporation and the Firestone Plantations Company to modify the contract with a view to improving existing conditions. It had emphasised that certain governments had declared a moratorium or defaulted in the payment of their obligations. This the Liberian Government had not yet done, but it was rapidly reaching the point at which, willingly or unwillingly, it might have to yield to *force majeure* and follow a similar course.

While deploring the delay in the negotiations, Mr. Grimes assured the Council that his Government would supply Mr. Lyle with the preliminary information which he required, provided that he had the necessary powers.

In conclusion, Mr. Grimes stated that his Government, having already accepted the proposal made by the Council to place the services of the Financial Organisation and M. Lighthart at its disposal, it would make no commitments as regards the plan proposed by

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 296.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 3, page 93.

the League, and would leave the negotiations to be conducted at Geneva.

M. de Madariaga (Spain), supported by Baron Aloisi (Italy), stressed the need felt by the Council for an urgent solution of the Liberian problem.

Count Racinski (Poland) agreed, adding that the difficulties of Liberia's present financial situation might necessitate the conclusion, as a temporary measure, of a financial arrangement

with the Vice-President of the Finance Corporation of America, pending the termination of the negotiations at Geneva.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) emphasised that he understood the mission of the Vice-President of the Finance Corporation to Liberia to be purely one of inquiry, and that the actual negotiations would take place later at Geneva in accordance with the suggestions of the Council Committee.

IX.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

MODEL ADMINISTRATIVE CODE FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE 1931 CONVENTION LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.*

The Council at its meeting of November 28th dealt with the Model Administrative Code drawn up by a special Sub-Committee of the Advisory Committee on traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, with a view to the application of the 1931 Convention limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs.†

The Council decided to circulate this model code to the Governments, with a recommendation that they should take it into consideration in framing the necessary legislative and administrative measures for the application of the Convention.

This communication, which would, the Council felt, promote ratification of the Convention, will be accompanied by a copy of the Model Administrative Code for the 1925 Opium Convention, drawn up in 1928 by the Opium Advisory Committee.

During the Council discussion M. Wellington Koo (China) stated that the two codes were without parallel in the League's history. The League was constantly seeking to secure co-ordination in the administrative practice of the Governments in various fields. It was in this field alone, however, that it had succeeded in drawing up a model administrative code. He recalled that a closer approximation to world uniformity of legislation had been reached

in the field of dangerous drugs than in most other fields of international activity. The codes before the Council constituted a fresh advance, and made it possible to look forward in the not distant future to world uniformity of administrative practice in this sphere.

M. Wellington Koo drew the Council's attention to the progress achieved by the League in the campaign against narcotic drugs since the question was first tackled in 1921. At that date there were few and not very effective national laws in existence. The situation was now entirely different, a quantity of facts on the problem were available, and practically every country had passed legislation on the subject.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) recalled that League experience in the field of narcotic drugs had proved that the real source of the evil was the manufacture rather than the traffic. To control manufacture involved *ipso facto* control of the whole traffic. Similar results might, he felt, be achieved in the field of armaments. Here, too, the League had first dealt with control of the traffic and had drawn up a Convention in 1925. M. de Madariaga proposed that the Secretary-General should forward to the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference for purposes of information the results achieved in the campaign against narcotic drugs, in so far as this information might be of interest in connection with the study of the manufacture of and traffic in arms.

The Czechoslovak and French representatives supported M. de Madariaga's view.

The Secretary-General stated that he would examine the question and would consider what points it might be desirable to bring to the attention of the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 299.

† Rapporteur: the representative of the Irish Free State.

X.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

December 15th.—Committee on Public Works, Geneva.

December 19th.—Committee on the Allocation of League Expenses, Geneva.

1933.

January 9th.—Second Session of the Preparatory Commission of Experts for the Economic and Monetary Conference, Geneva.

January 9th.—Financial Committee, Geneva.

January 23rd.—Bureau of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Geneva.

January 23rd.—Seventieth Session of the Council, Geneva.

January 25th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

January 26th.—Organising Committee of the Council for the Monetary and Economic Conference, Geneva.

January 31st.—General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Geneva.

February 13th.—Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

May ?—Monetary and Economic Conference, London.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.*

I. INTERPRETATION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1919 CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN DURING THE NIGHT.

On November 15th the Court delivered its Advisory Opinion on the following question, which had been submitted to it by the Council at the request of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office :

"Does the Convention concerning employment of women during the night, adopted in 1919 by the International Labour Conference, apply, in the industrial undertakings covered by the said Convention, to women who hold positions of supervision or management and are not ordinarily engaged in manual work?"

By six votes against five (Baron Rolin Jacquemyns, Count Rostworowski, MM. Fromageot, Anzilotti and Schücking) the Court answered this question in the affirmative. M. Anzilotti has subjoined to the Opinion of the Court a dissenting opinion; the other Judges who were not in agreement with the Opinion have contented themselves with adding a statement of their dissent.

The question submitted to the Court had its origin in a difficulty which the British Government had encountered, for several years past, in the application of Article 3 of the Convention in question; that Article is worded as follows :

"Women, without distinction of age, shall not be employed during the night in any public or private industrial undertaking, or in any branch

thereof, other than an undertaking in which only members of the same family are employed."

The British Government regarded this provision as applying to all women, without exception, employed in industry, but at the same time they considered that an exception ought to be made in favour of women occupying posts of supervision or management. They therefore proposed that the Convention should be revised in that sense; as it proved impossible to obtain agreement upon this revision—for one reason because the terms of the Convention were interpreted in very different ways by the different States—the British Government took steps to have an Advisory Opinion obtained from the Court.

The doctrine of the Court on this subject is contained in the following passage of its Opinion of November 15th :

"The wording of Article 3, considered by itself, gives rise to no difficulty; it is general in its terms and free from ambiguity or obscurity. It prohibits the employment during the night in industrial establishments of women without distinction of age. Taken by itself, it necessarily applies to the categories of women contemplated by the question submitted to the Court. If, therefore, Article 3 of the Washington Convention is to be interpreted in such a way as not to apply to women holding posts of supervision and management and not ordinarily engaged in manual work, it is necessary to find some valid ground for interpreting the provision otherwise than in accordance with the natural sense of the words."

Having laid down this principle and having noted that there is nothing in the provisions

* This chapter has been compiled on the basis of material supplied by the Registry of the Court.

of the Convention of Washington, other than Article 3, which would be inconsistent with the terms of the latter Article, the Court examines and rejects certain arguments which have been put forward to show that the natural meaning of the Article might be disregarded.

The first of these arguments is to the effect that the Washington Convention on the employment of women during the night, being a labour convention in the sense of the "Labour" portions of the Peace Treaties of 1919, ought to be interpreted as applicable solely to manual workers, for the reason that the chief object of the Labour portions of the said Treaties was the improvement of the lot of the manual workers.

The next argument is that the circumstances in which the Convention was adopted at Washington furnish adequate grounds for restricting its application to women engaged in manual work, more especially because the Convention of Washington was merely an extension and application of the Berne Convention of 1906, an instrument which was concerned solely with women performing manual work.

Lastly, there was the argument that the Convention of Washington does not cover women occupying posts of management, because in 1919 such cases were very few in number, and therefore were not under consideration.

The Court was struck with the confident opinions expressed by several persons who have expert knowledge of the subject, in particular at the International Labour Conferences, to the effect that the Convention only applied to working-women, properly so-called. In connection with this argument—and in that connection only—the Court examined the preparatory work of the Convention, and it reached the conclusion that the preparatory work does not give sufficient support to the opinion just alluded to. On the contrary, in the Court's view, the preparatory work confirms its opinion that there is no good reason for interpreting the Article otherwise than in accordance with the natural meaning of the words.

The Court further finds this conclusion corroborated by a comparison of the terms of the Convention concerning Employment of Women during the Night and the Convention drawn up at Washington in 1919, and usually known as the "Eight-Hour Day Convention."

2. THE PRINCE OF PLESS ADMINISTRATION (GERMANY-POLAND).

For the examination of this case the Court is composed as follows:

MM. Adatci (Japan), President; Guerrero (Salvador), Vice-President; Baron Rolin Jaquemyns (Belgium); Count Rostworowski (Poland); MM. Fromageot (France); Anzilotti (Italy); Urrutia (Colombia); Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain); MM. Schücking (Germany); Negulesco (Roumania); Jonkheer van Eysinga (Netherlands); and M. Wang (China).

The German Government is represented before the Court by its Agent, M. Kaufmann, professor of law at the University of Berlin; and the Polish Government by its Agent, M. Thadeus Sobolewski, Doctor of Laws and Principal Adviser to the Department for State Litigation, assisted by M. Gaston Jèze, Professor of the Faculty of Law at Paris, as Counsel.

In the course of public sittings held on November 7th, 9th, 10th and 11th, the Court heard the pleadings, reply, and rejoinder on the preliminary objection filed by the Polish Government,* presented by MM. Sobolewski and Jèze on behalf of the Polish Government, and by M. Kaufmann on behalf of the German Government.

The Court is now deliberating upon the preliminary objection.

3. LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND (DENMARK-NORWAY).

For this case the Court is composed as follows: MM. Adatci, President (Japan), Guerrero, Vice-President (Salvador), Baron Rolin Jaquemyns (Belgium), Count Rostworowski (Poland), MM. Fromageot (France), Anzilotti (Italy), Urrutia (Colombia), Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain), MM. Schücking (Germany), Negulesco (Roumania), Jonkheer van Eysinga (Netherlands), Wang (China); MM. Zahle and Vogt, judges *ad hoc*, appointed respectively by the Danish and Norwegian Governments.

The Danish Government is represented before the Court by its Agent, M. Harald de Scavenius, Danish Minister at The Hague. M. de Scavenius is assisted by M. K. Steglich-Petersen, advocate at the Supreme Court of Denmark, as agent and advocate; by M. Charles de Visscher, Professor at Ghent, as advocate and counsel; by M. Georg Cohn, doctor of law, head of division at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, as counsel; by M. N. V. Boeg, President of the Greco-Turkish Arbitral Tribunal at Istanbul, as advocate, and by M. Gustav Rasmussen, head of section at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, as assistant-advocate.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 306.

The Norwegian Government is represented before the Court by its Agent, M. Jens Bull, Norwegian Chargé d'Affaires at The Hague. The Norwegian Government has also appointed as agents and counsel: M. Arne Sunde, advocate at the Supreme Court of Norway, former Minister of Justice; M. Per Rygh, advocate at the Supreme Court of Norway; as counsel and advocate: M. Gilbert Gidel, professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris and at the Ecole libre des sciences politiques of Paris.

The hearings opened on November 21st, when MM. Zahle and Vogt, having made the

solemn declaration provided for by Article 20 of the Statute and Article 5 of the Rules of Court, were duly declared installed as Judges *ad hoc* for the case.

In the course of public sittings held on November 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 28th, 29th and 30th, the Court heard the statements presented by MM. Boeg, Rasmussen, Steglich-Petersen and de Visscher on behalf of the Danish Government. The Court will next hear the statement of the Norwegian Government's case, and subsequently the oral Reply and Rejoinder.

ANNEX.

SUMMARY OF THE OBSERVATIONS OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT RELATIVE TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.*

The Japanese Government appreciates the efforts of the Commission to gain a comprehension of an extremely complex and generally misunderstood situation. It is, however, easy to understand that a very brief stay did not permit it to obtain a complete idea of the state of affairs prevailing in China; in particular, it visited only a very small fraction of Chinese territory, and, moreover, on the most controversial points, it was able to base its judgment only upon extremely doubtful testimony which it apparently did not submit to a sufficiently critical examination.

I. THE GENERAL SITUATION IN CHINA.

A large number of the findings of the Report confirm the Japanese thesis that "China is not an organised State"; and it is impossible to understand why the Commission refuses to subscribe to this formula. It invokes the Washington Conference; but, even at that time, the conception of a unified and organised China was but a hoped-for ideal, not an established fact, and since 1922 the situation has only become worse.

The Report admits the impotence of the Central Government, which has been still more aggravated recently by several serious revolts.

The Report affirms, on the one hand, the existence in China of a profound xenophobia, recently increased by the propaganda of the Kuomintang; the boycott and anti-foreign teachings in the schools are the most serious manifestations of this state of mind. But what the Report does not point out, and what the Japanese Government insists upon emphasising, is that the boycott, with the acts of violence which accompany it, is employed as an instrument of national policy, as a means of extorting from the foreign Powers the relinquishment of the rights which they possess under treaties.

The Report recognises that the Kuomintang has introduced into the nationalism of China an additional and abnormal shade of antagonism against all foreign influence. It recognises also that "Japan has suffered more than any other Power" from the anarchic condition of China.

Anarchy and xenophobia have obliged the Powers, for the protection of their rights and interests, to institute in China a system which exists nowhere else. They possess not only territorial rights but vast concessions where they exercise police rights, their troops and war-vessels are stationed there and have had on many occasions to be employed.

It appears from these facts that the legal and factual situation in China has an entirely exceptional character and does not lend itself to the application of rules elaborated for countries in which an organised government exists.

2. MANCHURIA.

The Commission does not appear to have brought out with sufficient precision the real status of Manchuria.

The bond which formerly united Manchuria to China was one "of personal union"; the Manchurian chieftains who had conquered China ruled at the same time over the two countries. Even if it is admitted that the Revolution of 1911 resulted in the incorporation of Manchuria into China—a doubtful hypothesis—it is certain that the downfall of the unified Republic in 1916 led to the break-up of China; and since that time Manchuria regained its traditional independence; the proclamations of Chang Tso-lin were the official manifestations of this fact.

The Commission noted—without stressing the point sufficiently—the maladministration of the Changs and the existence of "nepotism" and "corruption," of which the people of Manchuria have been the victims. It recalled that 80 per cent. of the budget was absorbed by military expenditures. It did not, however, sufficiently describe the manipulations of the currency which ruined the country.

The "special position" claimed by Japan for itself in Manchuria was spoken of as a "mystery." It is, however, simple; it results from the sum of the numerous and important rights which Japan possesses under treaties, and the natural consequences of proximity, and the geographical, historical, and economic situation. These interests are special and vital; they justify measures of auto-protection, such as are admitted by international law, and such as have been recognised, for example, in the typical case of the "*Caroline*."

These rights of Japan find confirmation and additional justification in the work of civilisation which she had accomplished in Manchuria during more than twenty-five years. The Japanese Government regrets that the Report of the Commission has not more explicitly recognised these facts. Even though Japan's work was achieved with the assistance of a mass of Chinese immigrants, the affluence of these immigrants was essentially caused by the attraction held forth by a Manchuria immune from disorder owing to Japan's presence.

* A summary of the Chinese observations on the Report of the Commission of Inquiry will be published in the forthcoming number of the *Monthly Summary*.

The Report mentions certain grave attacks against Japanese rights: the policy of encirclement practised against the South Manchurian Railway; obstacles to the leasing of land; oppression of Japanese subjects, especially Koreans; and the murder of Captain Nakamura. It is regrettable that the Report deals with these points separately and abstains from drawing from them a comprehensive view of the situation. These various attacks are but open manifestations of the fixed determination to destroy Japanese rights in Manchuria.

That is a fact of capital importance; if it is disregarded, an understanding of the incident of September 18, 1931, is impossible. The summary of the attacks directed against Japan appears in Chapter II. of the Report, while the incident of September is dealt with only in Chapter IV. It is essential that the close connection between these two sets of facts should be re-established.

If this is done, it will be seen that it was China, and not Japan, which adopted an aggressive policy in Manchuria.

3. THE INCIDENT OF SEPTEMBER 18, 1931.

That part of the Report dealing with the September incident gives rise to important remarks.

First, the Commission notes the existence "of a minutely prepared plan in case of possible hostilities." It is beyond doubt that the Japanese Army had such a plan; it would have failed in its duty had it not been thus prepared in view of the threatening situation and the presence of a hostile force the numerical superiority of which was twenty to one.

The Report seems to attribute much importance to the fact that the Chinese attack of September 18 was neither "concerted nor authorised"; but the important fact is that the attack took place, thus automatically putting the Japanese emergency plan into operation.

The Report contests the claim that the Japanese operations possessed the character of legitimate self-defence. But the declarations made during the preparation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact reserve to each one of the contracting Powers the right to determine the legitimacy of the military measures which it might be forced to take for the protection of its rights. The definition given by Webster of cases of auto-protection is generally accepted: cases of "necessity immediate and overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, no moment for deliberation." The incident of September conforms precisely to this definition: the interests endangered constituted nothing less than Japan's whole position in the Far East.

The Japanese Government cannot permit the necessity or the pertinence of its action to be placed under discussion.

4. THE NEW STATE.

The Japanese Government regrets that the Commission gave credit to opinions sometimes anonymous and highly unreliable, while it cast aside the solemn declarations of the Japanese Government, documents presented by the authorities of the new State, and statements emanating from important local organisations.

The Japanese Government experiences a certain astonishment that the Commission could entertain the notion that "the independence of Manchuria was something never heard of before September, 1931." Manchuria has been for centuries a territory entirely distinct, possessing its own geographic, economic, and administrative unity. Independence was declared by Chang Tso-lin on several occasions. Finally, in recent years, the maladministration of the Changs and their policy of military adventures had given rise to the important movement of "Paoching Anmin" (protection of the frontiers and maintenance of peace). It was but a short step from this movement to complete independence in name and in fact.

The independence movement is so natural a consequence that it is surprising that it can be taken as the machination of the Japanese military authorities. The opposition against the Changs transformed itself, when Chang Hsueh-liang joined hands with Nanking, into a separatist movement which combined quite naturally with another movement for the restoration of the Manchu dynasty.

Neither the Government nor the Japanese General Staff exerted any influence on the movement at its origin. Baron Shidehara, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and General Minami, Minister of War, both gave instructions, on September 26, forbidding Japanese participation in the diverse attempts to establish a new political authority in Manchuria. But when the movement had taken shape among the Chinese, Manchus and Mongols, the Japanese could no longer be expected to ignore it.

It may be true that the presence of Japanese troops gave the movement its chances of success. But those troops were in Manchuria in the exercise of a legal right, and the fact that their presence favoured the development of the independence movement detracts in no way from its legitimacy. Analogous historical instances are very numerous; the fact that independence was proclaimed in the presence of foreign troops has never given rise to the contestation of that independence.

The Report pretends that the population is on the whole hostile to the new régime. It seems to have attributed unjustified importance to 1,500 letters from unidentified Chinese; but, considering the intensity of Chinese propaganda, it is surprising that a population of 30,000,000 inhabitants sent only 1,500 letters of protest. This proportion itself proves that the new government has been well received by the population as a whole, which has seen in its creation an opportunity to be delivered from the oppression of the Changs.

The new government is a civil government, the first of this kind which the country has known since the downfall of the Manchu dynasty ; it has nothing to fear from any comparison with any of the autocratic and militaristic governments which dominate at the present time various portions of China.

The Report pronounces with severity on the prospects lying before the new administration. In fact this administration has succeeded within a very short space of time in organising methodically the repression of disorder and in creating a highly satisfactory financial situation. From March 1st to June 30th, 1932, 9,300,000 Yuan of revenue corresponded to 9,100,000 of expenditure ; and the budget of the current fiscal year (July 1st, 1932, to June 30th, 1933) is perfectly balanced. As a result of the excess of exports over imports, a great quantity of money flows to Manchuria, which enables it to maintain the value of its currency.

In such circumstances, would it not have been an act of justice on the part of the Commission, which, in spite of all the proofs of a most discouraging nature, show itself so indulgent towards China, to display some patience with regard to a State which has behind it only six months of existence ?

5. FINAL REMARKS.

The point which comes out most clearly from the whole of the findings reported is that the situation out of which the Sino-Japanese conflict arose possesses an entirely exceptional character. As the Report says : " The present case is not that of a country which has declared war against another without having previously exhausted the possibilities of conciliation furnished by the Covenant of the League of Nations. Nor is it a question of a simple case of violation of frontier by the armed forces of a neighbouring country, the situation of Manchuria being, in many respects, without an exact parallel in other parts of the world."

The Report recognises that the restoration of the *status quo ante* would only lead to the renewal of difficulties. But it likewise rejects the maintenance of the present régime. The Japanese Government, on the contrary, is firmly convinced that this solution would be in no wise contrary to international obligations, that it would give satisfaction to the aspirations of the peoples of Manchuria, and that it would finally come to be considered by China herself as the only satisfactory basis for stable relations.

Japan is particularly desirous of seeing the establishment of stable conditions in Manchuria ; it was in view of this stabilisation that it deemed it opportune to recognise the new State and to sign the Protocol of September 15 last, which has as its object the protection of the rights and interests of Japan in Manchuria and the preservation of the territorial integrity of Manchoukuo.

In a remarkable passage, the Report emphasises the essential fact that the situation develops from day to day, and that the Council should not fail to take account of this evolution. The Japanese Government is entirely disposed to provide the Council with all the documents which might enlighten it on the recent changes in the situation.

The Commission remarked that it had received no mandate to formulate recommendations ; it intended to present only certain suggestions the importance of which is diminished, a fact admitted even by the Commission, in the light of new events which it had not itself foreseen. It is with this fundamental reservation that the following remarks are presented :

(a) The Commission envisages the establishment of an international control over China ; neither Manchoukuo nor Japan can accept such a control in Manchuria.

(b) Several suggestions made by the Commission presuppose that the parties in conflict both possess strong and stable central governments ; in the absence of such a condition, the application of the suggestions in question could only aggravate the disorder.

(c) The demilitarization of Manchuria and the sole creation of an international police force would be, in view of the vastness of the territory, insufficient to maintain order and security.

In conclusion, the Japanese Government feels obliged to declare that, although certain of the suggestions made by the Commission are in principle acceptable to it and have even been realised in fact by the Protocol between Japan and Manchoukuo, those which depend upon the establishment in China of a strong government cannot be considered capable of realisation in the near future ; Japan cannot passively await the realisation of so uncertain an eventuality.

Would it not be the wiser policy to work at least for the stability of the situation in Manchuria ?

When the Manchurian question is settled, the greater question of China will be materially simplified. The establishment of peace and of sane and effective administration in Manchuria would be an example for China ; and when the latter should decide to follow this example, she would assure the happiness of the Chinese people and at the same time secure to other nations the benefits of the salutary effects of this transformation.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ENTRUSTED BY THE COUNCIL WITH THE STUDY OF THE FRONTIER BETWEEN SYRIA AND IRAQ.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VI. A.I.)

43 pages and 4 maps as annexes Price 6s. \$1.50

The Commission was appointed by the Council to collect on the spot all information that might assist it in solving the question of the frontier between Syria and Iraq. Its report contains :—

(1) A survey of the question from its origin ; (2) a description of the Commission's proceedings ; (3) a study of the Franco-British Convention of 1920, which was intended to delimit the frontier but was never put into effect ; (4) a statement on the Commission's examination of the geographical, ethnographical, economic, military, and political factors. In conclusion, the Commission formulates its suggestions for an equitable frontier based on the information obtained during its inquiry.

Appended are a 1:1,000,000 map on which the 1920 Convention was based ; a 1:500,000 map of the entire frontier area ; and a 1:200,000 map showing the Commission's suggested frontier in detail.

REQUEST OF THE KINGDOM OF IRAQ FOR ADMISSION TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 9.)

6 pages Price 6d. \$0.15

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE SUBMITTED BY THE LIBERIAN GOVERNMENT.

DR. MACKENZIE'S MISSION TO THE KRU COAST.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 10.)

14 pages Price 9d. \$0.15

Deals with a mission to Liberia to pacify the Kru tribes who were engaged in war against the Government and amongst themselves. The report summarises the conditions found on arrival and the steps taken to stop hostilities. Ten appendices deal with the facilities granted to the League Commissioner by the Liberian Government, a brief description of the Kru and Grebo tribes, the method adopted in connection with the disarming of the tribes, notes on the principal intertribal disputes and how these were dealt with, the conditions of the truces made with a number of tribes, and finally the boundary cutting done through the bush in connection with the redivision of lands. There are four sketch maps.

Complete Catalogue sent free on application.

**PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
LEAGUE OF NATIONS
GENEVA**

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly):

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research. In some cases, these articles are contributed by leading economists or other persons of authority on industrial and labour affairs. In other cases, they are the outcome of the scientific study by the International Labour Office of questions coming directly under its examination.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 3s. \$1.25

4. *LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual):

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

5. *INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

6. *INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

7. *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (Trilingual) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

8. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the *Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

9. *I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual):

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

{ Paper bound	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
{ Cloth bound	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

10. STUDIES AND REPORTS:

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

*Studies on Industrial Relations. I. xii + 263 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. II. v + 162 pp.	{ Paper bound	3s. 6d.	\$1.00
	{ Cloth bound	5s. 0d.	\$2.00
<i>Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930.</i>				
iv + 692 pp.			16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
	{ Cloth bound	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
Housing Policy in Europe. Cheap Home Building. xii + 378 pp.			5s. 0d.	\$1.25
The Social Aspects of Rationalisation. vii + 381 pp.			8s. 0d.	\$2.00
Safety in the Manufacture and Use of Acetylene. vii + 188 pp.			6s. 0d.	\$1.50
*Women's Work under Labour Law. iv + 264 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
A Contribution to the Study of International Comparisons of Costs of Living. xii + 247 pp.			7s. 6d.	\$2.00

11. SPECIAL REPORTS:

The results of important special studies or researches carried out by the International Labour Office and similar studies made outside the Office.

TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: £8. \$40.00.

Comprising all the publications mentioned above and any *Special Reports* (11), or parts thereof which are published during the period covered by the total annual subscription. These include:—

*INTERNATIONAL LABOUR DIRECTORY:

The *International Labour Directory* contains information with regard to organisations, both official and unofficial, which deal with industrial and labour matters. Published in seven parts.

Price: 12s. 6d. \$3.25

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE:

The purpose of the *Encyclopedia of Industrial Hygiene* is to bring together all the information available in the various countries concerning industries or processes which may be considered unhealthy.

Brochure edition (English only)

£3 3s. 0d. \$16.00

Volume edition (in two volumes) {

Paper bound	£3 3s. 0d.	\$16.00
Cloth bound	£3 10s. 0d.	\$20.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 10) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN
Mr. M. R. K. BURGE,
12, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.1.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
Sovest, London.
Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)

U.S.A.
American Sales Agents:
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, Mount Vernon Street,
Boston 9, Mass.

JAPAN
Mr. J. ASARI,
Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya
Park, Kojimachiku,
Tokio. (Telegrams:
Kokusairodo, Tokio.
Telephone: Ginza 1580.)

INDIA
Mr. P. P. PILLAI,
International Labour Office
(Indian Branch),
New Delhi.
(Telegrams: Interlab,
New Delhi.)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Some Documents on the Sino-Japanese Conflict.

APPEAL BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 12)

148 pages, 14 maps Price : 10s. \$2.50

FULL TEXT OF THE LYTTON COMMISSION REPORT.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS

TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 14)

280 pages Price : 7s. 6d. \$2.00

Contains the Preliminary Report of the Commission of Inquiry, called Lytton Commission, the Appendix to the Report of this Commission, and the following special studies by the experts of the Commission :

Memoranda on Railway Questions.

What is the Economic Importance of Manchuria for Japan?

Chinese Migrations to Manchuria.

Memorandum on Public Finance in Manchuria prior to and after September 18th, 1931.

The Currencies of the North-Eastern Provinces, with a Supplement on the Central Bank of "Manchukuo."

Manchuria's Trade with China Proper and with Foreign Countries.

Chinese, Japanese and Other Foreign Investments in Manchuria.

Memorandum on Boycotts and Japanese Interests in China.

Korean Problems in Manchuria as Factors in the Sino-Japanese Dispute.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 15)

40 pages Price : 1s. 6d. \$0.40

COMMUNICATION

FROM THE CHINESE DELEGATION

(Ser. L. o. N. P., 1932, VII. 16)

34 pages Price : 1s. 3d. \$0.30

Complete Catalogue sent free on application.

**PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT
LEAGUE OF NATIONS
GENEVA**

THE
MONTHLY SUMMARY
OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 12.

DECEMBER, 1932.

The League of Nations
in 1931—1932.

Annual Subscription 8/-.
Single Copies - 1/-.
Double Number - 2/-.

Annual Subscription \$2.
Single Copies - - 20c.
Double Number - - 40c.

Agents for the United States :
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION,
40, MT. VERNON STREET,
BOSTON 9, MASS.

Agents for Great Britain,
Northern Ireland and the
Crown Colonies :
G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, LTD.,
League of Nations Department,
40, MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Agents for Canada :
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS
SOCIETY IN CANADA,
389, WELLINGTON STREET,
OTTAWA.

THE MONTHLY SUMMARY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

VOL. XII., No. 12.

DECEMBER, 1932.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. <i>The League of Nations in 1931-1932</i>	344
II. <i>Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments</i>	350
III. <i>Legal and Constitutional Questions : International Engagements ; Registration of Treaties</i>	352
IV. <i>Intellectual Co-operation : Intellectual Co-operation Organisation</i>	353
1. Meeting of the Executive Committee	353
2. Meeting of the Directors' Committee of the International Museums Office	353
V. <i>Protection of Minorities : Application of Agrarian Reform in Poland</i>	353
VI. <i>Administrative Questions :</i>	
1. Mandates	355
(a) Meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission	355
(b) The Assyrian Community in Iraq	355
2. Danzig : Question of " Direct Action "	357
VII. <i>Political Questions :</i>	
1. Appeal of the Chinese Government	357
2. Dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay	360
3. Dispute between the United Kingdom Government and the Imperial Government of Persia	362

	PAGE
VIII. <i>Social and Humanitarian Questions : Traffic in Women and Children in the East</i>	363
IX. <i>Internal Organisation Questions :</i>	
1. Appointment of the new Secretary-General of the League	363
2. Appointment of two Under-Secretaries-General	364
X. <i>Publications of the League : Review of World Trade in 1931 and 1932</i>	365
XI. <i>Forthcoming Events</i>	366

The Permanent Court of International Justice.

1. Legal Status of Certain Parts of Eastern Greenland	367
2. Prince of Pless Administration	367
3. Legal Status of Certain Parts of South-East Greenland	367
4. Composition of the Chamber for Summary Procedure	367

ANNEX I.

Proposals of the Japanese Government	368
--------------------------------------	-----

ANNEX II.

A Summary of the Chinese Comments on the Observations of the Japanese Government on the Report of the Commission of Inquiry and on the Statements made by the Japanese Representative on the Council	370
--	-----

All communications relating to the Monthly Summary should be addressed to the Information Section, League of Nations, Geneva.

I.—THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN 1931-1932.

GENERAL FEATURES.

The year 1931-1932 was a period of considerable activity for the League.

The Council, the Assembly or its Special Committee, and the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, have sat simultaneously or successively almost without a break.

During the year two new Members have been admitted to the League: Turkey, on July 10th, and Iraq, on October 3rd. The status of Iraq thus passed from that of a mandated territory to that of a sovereign state.

* * *

POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

The Sino-Japanese Conflict.—The dispute in Manchuria between China and Japan has required the close and continued attention of the League.

Following upon the departure for the Far East in February of the Commission of Inquiry, presided over by Lord Lytton, first the Council and later a Special Assembly, summoned at the request of China under Article 15 of the Covenant, succeeded, in co-operation with the United States of America, in bringing hostilities to an end in the Shanghai area, from which the Japanese troops were withdrawn at the end of May.

The Assembly, on March 11th, declared that it was impossible for any State Member of the League to recognise a situation brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League and the Pact of Paris.

On July 1st the Assembly, pending the results of the inquiry undertaken and as an exceptional measure, prolonged the period of six months provided in Article 12 of the Covenant for drawing up its report on the dispute.

The conclusions of the Commission of Inquiry were published at the beginning of October. The "Lytton Report" first summarises and comments upon the events of the last year in the Far East, and, in particular, on the establishment of a new Government in Manchuria and then sets out definite proposals for the solution of the dispute.

On the basis of this report and the observations submitted by China and Japan, the Council, in November, and the Special Assembly in December, have continued to work for a solution by conciliation.

Bolivia and Paraguay.—The dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay was on several occasions considered by the Council. Fresh incidents

occurred in the Chaco Boreal at a moment when the Bolivian and Paraguayan delegates were negotiating at Washington, under the auspices of a Commission of Neutrals, with a view to the conclusion of a bilateral pact of non-aggression. The Bolivian delegate, on July 21st, accordingly brought the matter to the notice of the Secretary-General.

The Paraguayan Government, in a communication dated July 27th, gave a different account of the same incidents and declared its readiness to submit the dispute to peaceful procedure.

The Acting President of the Council, considering that the situation was likely to disturb peace and good understanding between two League Members, requested the Secretary-General to follow the progress of events.

There followed an exchange of notes between the parties, and various communications were addressed to the Secretariat and the Council. The President of the Council on several occasions appealed to the parties, recalling their obligations under the Covenant. The two Governments replied that they were in principle prepared to continue their efforts to reach a peaceful solution.

The Council Committee set up to follow the development of the dispute got into touch with the Washington Commission of Neutrals. It informed the Commission of the conditions which it thought likely to lead to the cessation of hostilities and a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

The Memel Directorate.—The attention of the Council was drawn by the German Government on February 8th to the fact that the President of the Memel Directorate had been dismissed by the Lithuanian Government and provisionally replaced. The German Government considered that this act constituted a violation of the Statute of Memel. The Lithuanian Government, however, contested this view. The question, after consideration by the Council, was referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice by the French, United Kingdom, Italian and Japanese Governments. These Governments also contested the regularity of the dissolution of the Chamber of Representatives of the Territory of Memel by the Governor on March 22nd, 1932. The Court decided that the Governor of the Memel Directorate had the right, in certain circumstances, to dismiss the President of the Directorate. But it considered that the dissolution of the Chamber of Representatives, so long as the Directorate appointed

by the Governor did not possess the Chamber's confidence, was irregular.

Claim of the Finnish Government.—The Council also examined the claim of the Finnish Government against the United Kingdom Government regarding Finnish vessels used by that Government during the war. After an exchange of observations between the two parties with reference, in particular, to the competence of the Council, a Committee was appointed to clear up the matter. The Committee considered that the Council was qualified to deal with questions such as that brought up by the Finnish Government, but formulated two points of procedure which must first be settled.

The two parties agreed to reach a settlement, and the Council asked that it should be kept informed of the development of the matter.

Anglo-Persian Dispute.—The Council was called upon at its meeting of December 19th, 1932, to deal with a dispute which had arisen between the United Kingdom and the Imperial Government of Persia as the result of steps taken by the Persian Government to cancel the concession owned by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. The United Kingdom laid this matter before the Council under Article 15 of the Covenant.

The representative of the Persian Government asked for time to produce the necessary documentation, and further consideration of the matter was postponed by the Council until its January session.

The Council had previously approved a telegram, sent by its President to the parties asking them to refrain from any act likely to aggravate or extend the dispute. The parties gave the assurances requested.

Liberia.—As a result of a request for assistance from the Liberian Government, experts appointed by the Council were sent to Monrovia to study the position. The experts recommended that certain reforms should be applied under the supervision of foreign experts. Since, however, the resources of Liberia were inadequate for the purpose, the experts made it a condition that an agreement should be reached with two American financial groups particularly interested in the development of the country. So far the negotiations with these two groups have not been successful and the plan of assistance consequently remains in suspense.

The Council, also at Liberia's request, sent a representative to the Kru coast to bring about the pacification of the tribes that had revolted.

In collaboration with the Liberian Government, Dr. Mackenzie successfully accomplished his difficult mission within two months.

THE ORGANISATION OF PEACE.

The Disarmament Conference was opened at Geneva on February 2nd, 1932, with Mr. Arthur Henderson in the Chair. Sixty States, seven of them non-Members of the League, were represented.

The Conference, having organised its work, heard statements from the delegations on disarmament policy and set up a General Commission to make a preliminary study and to co-ordinate the plans and proposals that might be submitted. The General Commission was also authorised to constitute, when need arose, the appropriate commissions, committees or sub-committees.

The General Commission set up five special Commissions: the Land, Naval, Air, and National Defence Expenditure and Political Commissions. It then decided to continue its discussions within the framework of the draft Convention drawn up by the Preparatory Commission in 1930, the delegations retaining, however, full liberty to develop their proposals and submit any amendments.

The technical Commissions announced from the outset that the progress of their work was dependent upon decisions of principle which must first be taken by the General Commission. The General Commission accordingly adopted the following resolutions:—

1. That the reduction of armaments as provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations should, after this Conference has taken the first decisive step of general reduction to the lowest possible level, be progressively achieved by means of successive revisions at appropriate intervals.

2. That in determining the criteria for the limitation and reduction of armaments the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations shall be applied and that, in consequence, armaments must be reduced to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common consent of international obligations.

It will be necessary, further, to take account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State.

3. That it approves the principle of qualitative disarmament, *i.e.*, the selection of certain classes or descriptions of weapons the possession or use of which should be absolutely prohibited to all States, or internationalised by means of a general Convention.

4. That in seeking to apply the principle of qualitative disarmament as defined in the previous resolution, the Conference is of opinion that the range of land, sea, and air armaments should

be examined by the competent Special Commissions with a view to selecting those weapons whose character is the most specifically offensive or those most efficacious against national defence, or those most threatening to civilians.

These resolutions of the General Commission facilitated to some extent the study of the questions submitted to the technical Commissions. They did not, however, provide sufficient grounds for definite conclusions, and it proved impossible to reconcile the opinions of various delegations on numerous points.

In addition to the technical Commissions, special Committees were set up to deal with particular questions: chemical and bacterial warfare, moral disarmament, effectives, the manufacture of and trade in arms.

The General Commission has noted various reports from the technical Commissions and special Committees, in particular on supervision, the prohibition of chemical warfare, the maximum calibre of heavy artillery, the maximum tonnage of tanks, and the procedure to be followed in dealing with questions relating to air forces.

Comprehensive proposals constituting coherent schemes for the reduction of armaments have been deposited with the Bureau of the Conference and discussed: in particular, the Hoover Proposals, the French Plan, and the United Kingdom and Italian proposals.

The General Commission, on July 23rd, adopted a resolution containing a programme of work and setting out the points on which agreement had been reached between the delegations as a result of the discussions.

At the same meeting the German Government stated that it could not participate further in the work of the Conference unless its work were in future based on a recognition of the equality of rights between States.

The technical Commissions in the autumn continued their study of special questions, but the necessity of securing agreement between the delegations on basic principles and the desire to ensure the co-operation of all States led the Governments of Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy and the United States of America to undertake negotiations between themselves. These negotiations resulted in an agreement. The five Governments declared in this agreement that one of the fundamental principles that should guide the Conference should be the grant to Germany, and to the other Powers disarmed by treaty, of equality of rights in a system which would provide security for all nations. The four European Governments solemnly confirmed their intention

not to settle any present or future difference by resort to force.

Germany announced that she would resume her seat at the Conference.

The General Commission re-assembled on December 18th. It noted the resolution of the Five Powers and welcomed Germany's return to the Conference. The Commission and the Bureau then adjourned until January, 1933. A statement of the work done by the technical Commissions and Committees will then be drawn up and the lines laid down for the future work of the Conference.

Armaments Truce.—The Armaments Truce, adopted at last year's Assembly, expired on 1st November, 1932. The Conference decided to recommend to the Governments the extension of the truce for four months.

Fifty-one Governments have up till now signified their acceptance of this extension.

General Convention to Improve the Means of Preventing War.—The General Convention to improve the Means of preventing War, adopted at the 1931 Assembly, has been supplemented by rules for its application, as provided in Article 4. The rules were drawn up by the Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air Questions and adopted by the Council on May 18th, 1932. Rules for the constitution and working of Commissions of Inspection were also drawn up.

Collaboration of Women in the Organisation of Peace.—The collaboration of women in the organisation of peace was considered by the Assembly in 1932. In conformity with the Council's wishes, the women's organisations were consulted as to the nature and form which the collaboration of women should take in the work of the Disarmament Conference and, generally, in the organisation of peace. The Disarmament Conference and the Assembly were informed of the results of this inquiry.

Collaboration of the Press in the Organisation of Peace.—Similar inquiries, made of press associations in sixty-five countries regarding measures to be taken against the spreading of inaccurate information likely to trouble international relations, gave various international associations an opportunity of expressing their opinion.

* * *

ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL WORK.

The League's economic and financial activities during the year have been determined by the world economic crisis.

World Economic Crisis.—The League has not confined itself to theoretical investigations into

the disturbances caused by the crisis to international trade or to reviewing the particular measures adopted by various countries in defence of their position when menaced or compromised or to suggesting remedies to be used in improving commercial relations. At the last meeting of the Assembly it sent a pressing appeal to all countries to contribute as far as possible to the solution of present difficulties and to enlighten public opinion as to the necessity of making the sacrifices necessary to obtain international economic agreement, the sole means of returning to a normal position.

Economic and Monetary Conference.—It considered that the World Economic and Monetary Conference, to meet in London in 1933 under the auspices of the League, must try to find practical means for ridding international trade of the impediments from which it suffers (restrictions, prohibitions, currency control, the circulation of capital) and of facilitating the adjustments necessary to monetary stability and the re-establishment of credit.

The preparatory work on the agenda of the Conference has already begun.

Economic Work.—The work of the Economic Organisation during the year, apart from its study and investigation of the world crisis, included the establishment of a procedure for the friendly settlement of economic disputes between States, the completion of a unified customs nomenclature, a study of economic agreements and of various branches of production (coal, motor-cars, wood, hops), and the preparation of three draft veterinary conventions dealing respectively with the campaign against contagious animal diseases, the transit of live-stock, meat and other products of animal origin and the export and import of animal products other than meat.

Financial Work.—The Financial Organisation has had a particularly heavy task during the last twelve months.

Various Governments have successively applied for assistance and advice. Members of the Financial Committee have visited Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary and Roumania to study the position and to propose steps to remedy the state of affairs in agreement with the competent authorities. These investigations resulted in the Geneva Protocol of July 15th, which has just entered into force and allows Austria to issue a loan of three hundred million schillings. They further led to the preparation of a scheme of financial reform and economic reconstruction for Roumania which has not yet, however, been accepted by the Roumanian

Government. To the other countries which appealed to it the Financial Committee has merely given advice and furnished recommendations.

While paying special attention to problems of interest to certain States, the Financial Committee has continually emphasised the importance of taking active steps to deal with the financial system in general and the problem of gold and the return to the gold standard in particular. It has declared that a return to the gold standard should depend on certain conditions: freedom in the exchange of goods; a satisfactory solution of the reparations and war debts problem; the general adoption of certain guiding principles in respect of the working of the gold standard; the re-establishment of budget equilibrium by States and other public bodies; the adaptation of the cost of production and the cost of living in each country to the international economic and financial situation.

* * *

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

Amendments to the Covenant.—The question of amending the League Covenant was examined afresh and it was decided that the official text of the amendments which it was proposed to make in that instrument to bring it into harmony with the Pact of Paris should be prepared by a Committee composed of representatives of all the States Members. This Committee will meet when the work of the Disarmament Conference has advanced sufficiently far to justify a final decision.

Protocol of September 14th, 1929.—The Assembly considered the question of the Protocol of September 14th, 1929, regarding the revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and addressed a fresh appeal to the States which had not yet ratified it, asking them to do so as soon as possible.

Nationality of Women.—The Assembly also dealt with the nationality of women within the framework of the draft Hague Convention of April 12th, 1930. Articles 8 to 11 of the Convention were, in particular, considered, and, following upon an inquiry made of the women's organisations, the Assembly was asked to decide as to the advisability of amending them. Owing to certain difficulties of principle and procedure the Assembly did not think it advisable to revise this part of the Hague Convention, but the Secretary-General has been asked to continue the inquiry among the women's

organisations and to submit the information acquired to the Council.

* * *

THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

Communications and Transit.—The Communications and Transit Organisation has continued its work on commercial road transport; light signals for road traffic; reform of the calendar; attachment (*saisies conservatoires*) in river law; assistance and salvage in river navigation; the unification of transport statistics; the negotiability of rail transport documents; co-operation in civil aviation; measures to be taken in the case of serious interruption of the lines of communication used for international traffic; passport and visa formalities for officers and seamen in maritime navigation, etc.

Public Works.—Furthermore, it took up a new task confided to it by the Council, *i.e.*, the study of questions relating to public works likely to diminish unemployment and alleviate economic distress. It noted numerous plans submitted by various governments (Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Latvia, Poland and Yugoslavia). It did not give its opinion as to the possibilities or means of financing these projects, but merely studied their technical and economic value pending the stage at which they would be carried into effect.

Collaboration with China.—Lastly, the Communications and Transit Organisation has afforded assistance during the past year to the Chinese National Government. Experts have carried out local investigations in order to advise the Chinese Government on various important technical problems, while engineers were sent to China as representatives of the Communications and Transit Organisation with a view to collaboration in the preparation and management of public works, road construction and hydraulic works.

THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

The activities of the Health Organisation have not been relaxed during the past year. This Organisation, which had at the outset felt it necessary to make a choice among the health problems which might be successfully undertaken upon an international basis, subsequently passed into a second phase, devoting its attention to technical studies (research work in connection with leprosy, inoculation against diphtheria, etc.) likely to lead to general conclusions. A third phase is already indicated which calls for effective action. In illustration of the third phase several examples may be quoted: co-operation with the Greek Govern-

ment in establishing a plan of sanitary re-organisation which has led to the creation of a Centre of Hygiene at Athens; the action taken as a result of Bolivia's request for an inquiry into the sanitary position of that country; the work of the Permanent Biological Standardisation Commission; the work to be carried out in response to the South African Government's request concerning various sanitary problems, some of which are of essential interest to the Central and Southern districts of Africa, and the co-ordination of the campaign against epidemics in China.

Public Health and the Crisis.—Among the problems to which the Health Committee has devoted considerable attention are tuberculosis and the effects of the economic crisis on public health. These effects are to be seen, not only in faulty nourishment, which weakens the body and gives more foothold to disease, especially tuberculosis, but often in mental troubles. The Health Committee has taken up the task of dealing with this question and considering ways and means of future action.

INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

The work carried out in connection with intellectual co-operation has covered a wide field: the instruction of youth in the aims of the League; educational cinematography; broadcasting; the revision of school textbooks; the employment of workers' spare time; the scientific study of international relations; the intellectual rôle of the press; the preservation of historic monuments; the re-organisation of public instruction in China.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation made a special effort to assist the Chinese National Government by sending a mission of experts which has submitted a series of reforms to the Chinese authorities.

The Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and the Institute of Educational Cinematography at Rome have helped to prepare the Committee's work by collecting the necessary material and making essential investigations and studies.

* * *

SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

Traffic in Opium.—The Advisory Committee on Opium and the Permanent Central Opium Board have continued their work. The Committee noted the marked progress achieved as a result of legislative measures taken in certain countries, particularly in the reduction of the manufacture and export of narcotic drugs. The Central Board noted the progress made towards ratification of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs.

A special Committee has prepared a model administrative code for the application of the Convention.

Child Welfare.—The work of the League covered the education of blind children, the organisation of children's courts, and the treatment of illegitimate children.

Traffic in Women and Children.—The inquiry undertaken in the Far East has been completed and the results will be published. A constantly increasing number of countries have abolished the licensed house system and the regulation of prostitution.

Assistance to Refugees.—The work of assistance and relief has been continued by the Nansen International Refugee Office, which has provided dwellings, land or work for hundreds of thousands of refugees in Syria, Armenia, South America, etc.

Slavery.—The Assembly approved the setting up of an Advisory Committee to study the documentation concerning slavery furnished by the Governments and by the Secretariat in conformity with the 1926 Convention and to consider means for the gradual abolition of any survival of slavery or curtailment of liberty in the institutions or customs of certain countries.

The International Relief Union.—The Convention setting up an International Relief Union for populations stricken by disaster has now entered into force. This Convention was due to the initiative of the Italian Senator, Ciraolo. It became effective on December 27th, 1932, having received the necessary number of accessions and the necessary number of contributions for the constitution of an initial relief fund.

* * *

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

Questions Examined by the Council.—During the year the Council had to deal with several questions concerning the protection of minorities, some of which had been pending since 1931.

As regards the minorities in Poland two important affairs should be recalled, namely, that of the Ukrainian minorities, the examination of which was closed by the Council at its January session in 1932, and that of the application of the agrarian reform in Poland, which was submitted to the Council by the German Government and is still on the Council's agenda.

The Council has on several occasions discussed the questions concerning the application of the Geneva Convention in respect of Upper Silesia, and has, in consequence of a petition

from the Polish minority, stated that a part of the cases cited had occurred outside the territory to which the Convention applied, and that the other cases were on the whole not of sufficient importance to warrant examination by the Council.

Another affair concerning the property of the descendants of the former Szekler (Hungarian) frontier guard regiment in Transylvania (Roumania), which had occupied the Council's attention for some time, was closed by the adoption of a report providing a practical solution of the problem.

Minorities Committees.—As regards the examination of petitions by the Minorities Committees, the relevant statistics provided for by the Council Resolution of June 13th, 1929, were published for the year July 1st, 1931, to June 30th, 1932, in the Official Journal of the League.

A certain number of letters concerning the result of the examination of the petitions by the Minorities Committees have also been published, with the agreement of the Governments concerned.

* * *

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

Mandates.—The Mandates Commission in 1931 laid down the procedure to be followed in considering any request for the emancipation of a mandated territory. The Council and Assembly approved this procedure but specified that, as a preliminary condition, the degree of development of the country concerned must be closely studied in each individual case.

Emancipation of Iraq.—The Mandates Commission was, during 1932, called upon to consider a concrete case, that of Iraq. After studying the situation in the light of the general principles which it had itself laid down, the Commission expressed a favourable opinion. The Council consequently appointed a special committee to prepare a declaration to be adopted and signed by the Iraqi Government regarding the special guarantees to be afforded by Iraq for the protection of minorities, economic equality under the régime of most-favoured-nation treatment, judicial organisation, acquired rights and financial obligations, freedom of conscience and appeal procedure. The Iraqi Government furnished the necessary guarantees and the Council decided that the mandatory régime in Iraq should legally come to an end on the day of its admission to the League of Nations.

The admission of Iraq was unanimously voted by the Assembly on October 3rd. For

the first time since the inception of the mandatory system a country under tutelage has become a sovereign state.

Frontier Line between Syria and Iraq.—The Council received a request from the United Kingdom and French Governments asking it to delimit the frontier between Iraq and Syria. It sent a special commission to the spot to study the position and submit proposals. The representatives of the two Governments accepted the settlement proposed, and the Council appointed a Boundary Commission, presided over by a neutral, to delimit the frontier adopted, taking into account local needs and the possible inaccuracy of maps.

Examination of the Annual Reports.—The Commission examined the annual reports of the Mandatory Powers for the territories under their administration. It heard statements from the accredited representatives and requested supplementary information.

The Saar.—During 1932 the Saar Basin Governing Commission made an attempt to deal with unemployment, to regulate economic transactions and exchange operations with the Reich and to effect economies in the administration. The continuance of the economic crisis has had an unfortunate effect on the communal budgets and has made it necessary to take energetic steps to balance the budget of the territory.

Danzig.—The Council has on various occasions dealt with matters concerning Danzig, and attempted to settle disputes and claims between the Free City and the Polish Government. It has considered, in particular, disputes concerning access to and anchorage in the port of Danzig for Polish war vessels; the use by Poland of the port of Danzig; customs matters, and railway questions. Last December it noted with satisfaction that an agreement had been reached between the two parties in settlement of certain cases that had remained in suspense.

* * *

II.—CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments met on December 14th, 1932, following a meeting of the Bureau of the Conference on the previous day.

The President, Mr. Henderson, informed the Commission of the action taken by the Bureau and special Committees on the decisions con-

THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY FOR EUROPEAN UNION.

The Commission of Inquiry for European Union noted the work of the Stresa Conference, which had dealt with the financial situation in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the state of their national economy.

The Conference drew up two draft conventions, the first for the creation of a fund to be devoted to the revalorisation of cereals, the second recommending the constitution of a fund to promote the regularisation of monetary conditions in Central and Eastern Europe.

In conformity with the recommendations of the Conference, the Commission of Inquiry and a Committee of Experts appointed by the Council examined the scheme for the monetary normalisation fund.

Elections to the Council.—The Assembly elected the three non-permanent members of the Council. Mexico and Czechoslovakia were appointed by 46 votes to succeed Peru and Yugoslavia, whose mandate expired this year.

Poland, declared re-eligible by a previous vote of the Assembly, was re-elected by forty-eight votes out of fifty-two recorded.

Re-organisation of the Secretariat.—The Assembly, continuing its study of the re-organisation of the Secretariat and the rationalisation of the various organs of the League, requested the Supervisory Commission to carry out a detailed study of these questions during 1933.

The Assembly, reviewing the position of the higher officials of the Secretariat, created a second post of Deputy-Secretary-General, reserved for nationals of States not permanently represented on the Council.

Appointment of the Secretary-General.—At its meeting on October 7th the Council unanimously appointed Monsieur Joseph Anvol, Deputy-Secretary-General of the League, to succeed Sir Eric Drummond as Secretary-General. This appointment was approved by the Special Assembly at its meeting on December 9th, 1932.

tained in the resolution of July 23rd. During the preceding weeks the French, United Kingdom,* and, later, the Japanese Governments† had submitted general proposals. He

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 11, pages 322 *et seq.*

† The text of these proposals is annexed to this number of the Monthly Summary.

felt that the time had come for the General Commission to use the material embodied in these and in the other proposals before the Conference in constructing the draft Convention. As the result of conversations in Geneva between the representatives of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, France and Italy, agreement had been reached between the delegations of these five States† on the principles which should guide the Conference. He had been invited to meet those who were taking part in the conversations and had received from the British Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald—who during the conversations had acted as Chairman—the original English text of the agreement between the five delegations, which had been deposited with the Registry of the League. Mr. MacDonald, in communicating the document, had said that the representatives of the Powers participating in the conversations had unanimously decided that it would be useful for the President of the Conference to participate in any further conversations which might be necessary. He had replied that, subject to the approval of the Bureau, given on the following day, he was prepared to accept the invitation.

The representatives of Poland, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Hungary, Roumania, Uruguay, Greece, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belgium, Spain, China, France, the United Kingdom and the Irish Free State all emphasised

† The text of this Agreement reads as follows :—

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Italy have declared that one of the principles that should guide the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments should be the grant to Germany, and to the other Powers disarmed by Treaty, of equality of rights in a system which would provide security for all nations, and that this principle should find itself embodied in the Convention containing the conclusions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

This declaration implies that the respective limitations of the armaments of all States should be included in the proposed Disarmament Convention. It is clearly understood that the methods of application of such equality of rights will be discussed by the Conference.

On the basis of this Declaration, Germany has signified its willingness to resume its place at the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy are ready to join in a solemn re-affirmation to be made by all European States that they will not in any circumstances attempt to resolve any present or future differences between the signatories by resort to force. This shall be done without prejudice to fuller discussions on the question of security.

The five Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy declare that they are resolved to co-operate in the Conference with the other States there represented in seeking without delay to work out a Convention which shall effect a substantial reduction and a limitation of armaments, with provision for future revision with a view to further reduction.

that conversations such as those which had taken place between the five States should not constitute a precedent; there could be no question of taking decisions out of the hands of the Conference, or of presenting it with *faits accomplis*. The Five-Power Agreement was not, they urged, an act of the Conference, and the procedure which had been followed in no way modified the rights of the General Commission.

After the President and a number of delegations had expressed satisfaction at the presence of the German delegates at the Conference for the first time since July 23rd, M. von Weizsacker (Germany) thanked the President for his speech informing the Commission of the agreement and also his colleagues for their sympathetic welcome. He felt sure that no unexpected difficulties would arise so far as the application of the Five-Power Agreement was concerned; the agreement had been reached in that spirit of confidence and goodwill in which the Conference would resume its task and bring it to a speedy end.

On the proposal of the President, the General Commission unanimously adopted the following resolution :

"The General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, taking note of the conclusions reached in the conversations of the Five Powers as stated in the document handed by the British Prime Minister to the President of the Conference and reported to this Commission to-day :

1. Expresses its thanks to the British Prime Minister and his co-signatories for the success of their efforts, which have resulted in a notable contribution to the work of the Conference;
2. Welcomes the declaration that the five Powers are resolved to co-operate in the Conference with the other States represented in seeking without delay to work out a Convention which shall effect a substantial reduction and a limitation of armaments with provision for future revision with a view to further reduction."

The General Commission decided to hold its next meeting on January 31st, 1933, the Bureau meeting on January 23rd to prepare the agenda. The President stated that the Bureau in establishing a programme would take into account the desire of the French delegation that its plan should be discussed at an early date.

* * *

The Technical Committee of Experts of the Special Committee on Effectives, meeting with General Nygren (Sweden) in the Chair, continued its study of police forces and similar

formations with a view to determining which of them should be taken into account in calculating effectives.

* * *

The *Special Committee on Chemical, Incendiary and Bacteriological Warfare*, meeting with M. Pilotti (Italy) in the Chair on December 13th, finished the drafting of its replies to the technical questionnaire referred to it by the Bureau of the Conference.*

* * *

M. Jacomet (France), general rapporteur of the *Technical Committee of the Commission on National Defence Expenditure*, with the special rapporteurs, Mr. Lyon (United Kingdom), General Barberis and M. Petrucci (Italy), M. Sandler and M. Brunsog (Sweden), M. Ando (Japan), Colonel Kissling (Switzerland) and M. de Modzelewski (Poland), have provisionally drafted the various chapters of the general report which will contain the Committee's

conclusions on the documentation of the countries considered and on the special questions referred to the Committee by the full Commission. The Technical Committee will consider this draft report when it resumes work on January 10th, 1933.

* * *

The *Sub-Committee for the Private Manufacture of Arms* † set up by the Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War, meeting with M. Komarnicki (Poland) in the Chair, has drawn up two reports dealing, one with limitation of capital invested in the private manufacture of armaments and the other with personal restrictions imposed on armaments manufacturers. It has also begun its study of the licence systems in force in various States regarding armaments manufacture.

III.—LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

Registration of Treaties.

The international treaties and engagements registered with the League Secretariat in December include the following :

An Agreement between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Finland concerning recourse to arbitration for the claim of the Finnish Government in respect of the Finnish vessels used by the British Government during the war (London, September 30th, 1932), presented by the United Kingdom ;

An Exchange of Notes between Brazil and Estonia embodying a Commercial Agreement (Paris, September 30th, 1932), presented by Estonia ;

An Agreement between Belgium and France concerning the indemnification of civilians victims of the war (Paris, November 7th, 1929), presented by Belgium ;

An Exchange of Notes between Germany and Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the liquidation of German goods (London, July 26th, 1932, and Berlin, July 27th, 1932), presented by the United Kingdom ;

An Exchange of Notes between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France embodying an Agreement on reciprocal exoneration from the taxation of profits from the shipping industry (London, October 1st, 1932), presented by the United Kingdom ;

The Convention between Spain and France concerning the operation of the international station of Camfranc and the junction line between that station and the French station of Forges d'Abel (Paris, July 16th, 1928), presented by France ;

The Convention on Neutrality at Sea adopted by the Fourth Pan-American International Conference between the United States of America, the Argentine, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, etc. (Havana, February 20th, 1928), presented by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua ;

Various Agreements and Conventions between Roumania and Yugoslavia concerning the system of waterways (Belgrade, December 14th, 1931), presented by Yugoslavia ;

A series of Agreements between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France ; between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Netherlands concerning the exchange of postal orders and postal parcels.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 8/9, age 247, and No. 11, page 321.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 274.

IV.—INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION
ORGANISATION.

I. MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Executive Committee of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation met from December 17th to 18th at the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. Madame Curie Sklodowska presided. The Committee discussed methods of giving effect to the resolution of the last League Assembly on the part to be played by press in intellectual affairs,* and considered a proposal by Professor Shotwell on the work to be undertaken in the field of the political and social sciences.

The Committee also discussed various questions relating to broadcasting, the creation of national centres of educational documentation, and problems connected with intellectual rights.

The Committee heard a statement by M. Li Yu Ying, President of the Peking National Academy, on the creation of a Chinese Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. M. Li Yu Ying said that, in addition to this new body in China itself, there would be a permanent Chinese delegation to the international intellectual co-operation organisations in Europe, attached in particular to the League Committee and the International Institute of Intellectual

Co-operation. The Chinese Government proposed by these means to ensure China's regular participation in the intellectual development of other countries.

2. MEETING OF THE DIRECTORS' COMMITTEE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL MUSEUMS OFFICE.

The Committee of Directors of the International Museums Office, over which M. Jules Destrée presided, met at the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

The Committee considered various questions of direct interest to the national fine arts administrations, including the clandestine export of works of art, the professional training of restorers of works of art, the influence of maritime climatic conditions on works of art, the precautions to be taken for their transport by sea, and an international agreement on the subject of casts.

The Committee decided, on the invitation of the Spanish Government, to summon an international conference of experts to meet at Madrid in October, 1933, to study the problems of the modern construction of museums, their internal organisation, the various systems of showing collections, and the constitution of deposits and reserves.

V.—PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

APPLICATION OF AGRARIAN REFORM IN POLAND.

The Council, at its meetings of December 9th and 19th, dealt again with the application of Polish agrarian reforms in the Voivodships of Poznan and Pomorze and took note of the proposals submitted on the subject by its Committee.†

The Rapporteur, submitting these proposals, said that the Committee had aimed at a practical agreement in the general interests of the minority, rather than a purely legal settlement. He was convinced that the proposed settlement would safeguard the interests of the minority concerned. Thereby it was proposed to suspend all measures in application of the previous nominal lists pending a complete rectification of the disparity noted between the contribution to the agrarian reform of the majority and of the minority (approximately 5,500 hectares in

the Voivodship of Poznan and 3,900 in the Voivodship of Pomorze. In other words, actual expropriation of these areas would be suspended until such time as it could be applied without involving a disparity between the respective contributions of minority and majority land-owners.

The German representative, M. von Neurath, emphasised the importance of the question for the German minority and thanked the Council for its efforts to reach a practical settlement. The settlement proposed was not satisfactory, and the treatment meted out to petitions from the German minority in respect of agrarian reforms clearly showed the defects inherent in the procedure for the protection of minorities. He reminded the Council that the German Government had insisted in recent years in the Assembly and Council on the defects of that procedure and had pressed for its improvement. In his opinion the present procedure was only too apt to lead to artificial solutions containing no effective or genuine remedy. In the present

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 311.

† See Monthly Summary, 1932, Vol. XII., No. 5, page 161.

case the question at issue was whether the internal legislation of a country might be applied in a manner so discriminatory that a large part of the members of the minority lost their land or found themselves faced with economic difficulties so great as to force them to abandon their homes.

The German representative added that this discrimination in regard to the German minority had been expressly noted, not only by the first Minorities Committee, but also by the new Committee of the Council. He felt that the proposal to suspend temporarily the execution of the nominal lists, which the Committee advocated, was quite inadequate to produce the required practical results. It would, in fact, enable the Polish Government to correct the existing disproportion simply by including in a new nominal list a certain number of big Polish landowners who, for economic or other reasons, were no longer interested in the exploitation of their property. The Polish Government would in this way be able in a very short time to resume the execution of the old nominal lists and the injustice done to the minority would in no way be redressed.

The German representative further urged that the application of agrarian reform to the large German estates, which seemed to him to be an attempt by the Polish authorities to uproot the German minority, had its counterpart, in the case of small rural estates, in the exercise by the Polish Government of the right of pre-emption and its refusal to authorise the transfer of land. In these two questions the solution proposed by the Minorities Committee satisfied neither the needs nor the claims of the minority.

The German representative considered that no effective remedy for the situation could be found unless it were examined in detail. He did not in any case think it possible for the Council to accept the method proposed by the Committee, since it would not remedy the legitimate grievances of the minority, but would leave the wrong in existence.

He stated in conclusion that he could not accept a report and solution which furnished no effective guarantee for the reparation of the acknowledged injustice of which the German minority was the victim.

Count Raczynsky, representative of Poland, noted that owing to the German Government's refusal to accept the report submitted by the Committee of the Council the solutions proposed therein automatically fell to the ground. Without wishing to discuss the points raised by M. von Neurath, he nevertheless observed that the progress of the question of agrarian

reform in Poland was unlikely to encourage countries bound by minority engagements to show any great measure of conciliation. The Polish Government, in the hope of reaching a final solution, had at each stage in the procedure made fresh concessions. With the acceptance of these concessions the question had appeared to be finally closed, but after some time it had been revived, and the Polish Government had on each occasion been faced with new demands. He reminded the Council that the matter had been closed by a Minorities Committee in May, 1931. It had nevertheless been resumed in consequence of further petitions and brought before the Council by the German Government while another Minorities Committee was still dealing with the matter. Such a method, which involved instituting one procedure concomitantly with another, seemed hardly compatible with the spirit of the Minorities Treaty.

The Japanese representative, rapporteur to the Council, noting that the Minorities Committee's conclusions were not in their present form unanimously approved, asked for an adjournment in order to study the problem afresh in the light of the observations made.

On December 19th the rapporteur informed the Council that his Committee had examined the German representative's observations most carefully. It had also discussed the question with the German delegation. The proposals made during these discussions, however, were not such as to enable it to submit a solution acceptable to all the Members of the Council, and in these circumstances the rapporteur proposed that the question should be adjourned to the session of January, 1933, so that a further attempt might be made to reach a definite result.

The German representative expressed the hope that it would be possible in the interval between the sessions to arrive at a general settlement, and a settlement of the actual point at issue that would fully safeguard the interests of the minority in Pomerelia and Poznania.

The Polish representative reserved the right of his Government to define its attitude with regard to the report at a suitable moment and to propose any amendments it considered essential.

The President, closing the discussion and announcing the adjournment, said that he was sure both the representatives of Germany and Poland would agree that a final solution of the question would only be made possible by a display of goodwill.

VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. MANDATES.

(a) *Meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission.*

The twenty-second session of the Permanent Mandates Commission opened in Geneva on November 3rd and rose on December 6th, 1932. The Marquis Theodoli presided.

The Mandates Commission examined all the reports of the mandatory Powers for the year under review on the administration of the territories under mandate.

The Commission also considered the question of economic equality, with special reference to the purchase of material and supplies by the administrations of territories under A and B Mandates for their own use or for public works; the delimitation of the frontier between Syria and Iraq*; and the question of a closer administrative, customs and fiscal union of the mandated territory of Tanganyika with the neighbouring British possessions of Kenya and Uganda.

The Commission, finally, examined a number of petitions originating from various communities in Iraq,† Palestine and Trans-Jordan, Syria, the Cameroons and Togoland under French Mandate, Tanganyika and South West Africa.

The twenty-second session was attended by:

Mlle. Dannevig (Norwegian), Lord Lugard (United Kingdom), M. Merlin (French), M. Orts (Belgian), M. Palacios (Spanish), Count de Penha Garcia (Portuguese), M. Rappard (Swiss), M. Van Rees (Netherlands), M. Ruppel (German), M. Sakenobe (Japanese), Marquis Theodoli (Italian).

Mr. Weaver was present on behalf of the International Labour Office.

The following representatives of the mandatory Powers assisted the Mandates Commission in the examination of the various reports:

For Iraq: Mr. J. E. Flood, from the Colonial Office.

For Palestine and Trans-Jordan: The High Commissioner, Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Wauchope, K.C.B., C.M.G., C.I.E., D.S.O.; Mr. H. F. Downie, Colonial Office; Mr. S. Moody, O.B.E.

For the Cameroons under French Mandate: M. M. Besson, of the French Colonial Ministry;

M. Marchand, Commissioner of the French Republic in the Cameroons.

For the Cameroons under British Mandate: The Governor of Nigeria, Sir Donald G. Cameron, G.C.M.G., K.B.E.

For Togoland under French Mandate: M. M. Besson.

For Togoland under British Mandate: Mr. A. W. Cardinall.

For Runada Urundi: M. Halewyck de Heusch, Director-General of the Belgian Colonial Ministry.

For Tanganyika: The Right Honourable the Earl of Plymouth, P.C., Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies; Mr. G. F. Seel, Colonial Office; Mr. G. J. Partridge (from the Administration in Tanganyika).

For South-West Africa: Mr. C. T. Te Water, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in London; Mr. F. F. Pienaar.

For New Guinea: Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Donald Cameron, K.C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.

For Nauru: Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Donald Cameron, K.C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.

For Western Samoa: Sir Thomas Mason Wilford, K.C.M.G., K.C., High Commissioner for New Zealand in London.

For the Islands under Japanese Mandate: M. N. Ito, Deputy Director of the Japanese League of Nations Office; M. Mitsuda Horiguchi, former Governor of the Islands under Japanese Mandate.

For Syria and Lebanon: M. Ponsot, High Commissioner of the French Republic in Syria and the Lebanon; M. R. de Caix, former Secretary-General of the French High Commissariat.

The following number of the MONTHLY SUMMARY will contain an analysis of the Mandate Commission's report to the Council.

(b) *The Assyrian Community in Iraq.*

During its sixty-ninth session the Council twice dealt with the situation of the Assyrians in Iraq.

In the various petitions which reached the Permanent Mandates Commission prior to the termination of the mandatory régime in the country* the Assyrians had made the following demands:

(1) Mass transfer to a country under the rule

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XI., No. 12, page 328.

† See the article on this subject in the current number of the Monthly Summary.

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 8/9, page 256.

of any of the Western nations, or, if this were not possible, to Syria ;

(2) Recognition as a "Millet" (nation) domiciled in Iraq ;

(3) Restoration of their former homes in the regions from which they came, now in Turkish territory, or, failing that, the constitution of a "national home" open to all Assyrians ;

(4) Attribution to the Assyrian community of various political and educational rights.

The Commission, which endorsed the conclusions of its rapporteur, first noted the feelings of insecurity inspired in the Assyrians by the climate of the country in which they lived, by the sterility of the land which had been assigned to them, by the precariousness of their rights to cultivate the soil and, especially, by the scattering of their community among populations of other races.

It pointed out that the root causes of the state of unrest revealed by the petitions resided in the fact that it had not yet been possible to collect the Assyrians of Iraq into a homogeneous group in a region suitable to their needs. In the opinion of the Commission the absence of lands combining the requisite conditions for a settlement of this kind had not yet been proved. Further, there was nothing to show that the possibility of resettling the Assyrians in their country of origin must be definitely ruled out.

The Commission thought that the Assyrians would be more likely to remain loyal subjects if they were placed in conditions more closely approaching to those which they had been led to expect.

On the other hand, it considered that the desire for autonomy shown by the Assyrians could not be encouraged as their autonomy, if conceded, would imperil the unity of the Iraqi State.

The Commission, in view of these considerations, after having noted the observations of the United Kingdom Government, drew the Council's attention to the great importance, both for Iraq and for the Assyrians, of "providing the Assyrians with opportunities for settlement in a homogeneous group which would be in keeping with their traditions and would satisfy their economic needs."

The Council received this opinion from the Mandates Commission on December 5th, 1932.

M. Benes, representative of Czechoslovakia rapporteur, recalled the special circumstances in which the Mandates Commission had examined the petitions from the Assyrians, the British mandate for Iraq having been

terminated before the meeting of the Commission.

The representative of Iraq, Nouri Pasha es-Said, observed that the Commission's report had been inspired solely by a desire to help in reaching a solution of the question. There were two possibilities : either the Assyrians should be settled on acceptable terms in Iraq or they should be resettled in their country of origin.

With reference to the first of these alternatives, the representative of Iraq pointed out that an agreement would be feasible if the Assyrians were willing to settle in other districts than the mountainous country of the Vilayet of Mosul and if they renounced their desire to live in a compact body. The Iraqi Government had attempted, in so far as it was possible, to settle the Assyrians on such land as was available and had appointed for that purpose a Commission on which a representative of the Assyrian community was sitting. As a result of that Commission's work, steps had been taken to settle a large number of Assyrians, with care to avoid the dispersal of families.

The Iraqi Government was anxious to do everything in its power to assure to the members of the Assyrian community the fullest enjoyment of their rights.

The representative of Iraq stated that his Government had no objection whatever to the second alternative, namely, the resettlement of the Assyrians in their country of origin, and was prepared to facilitate the carrying out of such a proposal.

He observed, in conclusion, that it would be a mistake to suppose that the petitioners whose requests had been considered by the Mandates Commission represented the whole or even a majority of the Assyrians resident in Iraq.

The Chairman of the Mandates Commission, Marquis Theodoli, said that for several years the fate of the Assyrians settled in Iraq had continually occupied the Commission's attention, and it considered that there was some justification for the apprehensions felt by the Assyrians for the future of their race. The experience of the Commission had shown that in Iraq racial and religious prejudices still prevailed. He urged the view of the Commission that it was desirable that the Assyrians should be settled in a homogeneous group ; in the Commission's view there was no other solution for the problem.

M. Benes, rapporteur, pointed out that the Iraqi Government had communicated certain new documents which would have to be examined.

The Council, after noting the opinion of the Commission, entrusted the study of these

documents to a special Committee composed of the representatives of Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom.

This Committee submitted the following draft resolution to the Council on December 15th:

"The Council,

Adopts the view of the Permanent Mandates Commission that the demand of the Assyrians for administrative autonomy within Iraq cannot be accepted;

Notes with satisfaction the declaration by the representative of Iraq of the intention of the Iraqi Government to select from outside Iraq a foreign expert to assist it for a limited period in the settlement of all landless inhabitants of Iraq, including Assyrians, and in the carrying out of its scheme for the settlement of the Assyrians of Iraq under suitable conditions and, so far as may be possible, in homogeneous units, it being understood that the existing rights of the present population shall not be prejudiced;

Feels confident that, if these measures do not provide a complete solution of the problem and there remain Assyrians unwilling or unable to settle in Iraq, the Iraqi Government will take all such measures as may be possible to facilitate the settlement of the said Assyrians elsewhere;

Requests the Iraqi Government to be so good as to keep it informed in due course of the result of the foregoing measures."

M. Benes stated that in the opinion of the Special Committee the draft resolution would permit of a solution of the question and allow the Assyrian community to be settled in such a way as to obviate its being scattered among populations of other races.

Nouri Pasha es-Said who, together with M. Orbs representing the Mandates Commission,

had collaborated with the Committee, accepted the draft resolution, and assured the Council that the Iraqi Government would do its utmost to discharge its obligations.

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed his satisfaction with the proposed solution. In his opinion there was no reason why the Assyrians should not find in Iraq the prosperity, security, and contentment which everyone wished for them. He felt, however, that their future lay largely in their own hands. He was sure that the Iraqi Government would treat the Assyrians generously and would, by so doing, gain a new and valuable source of strength for its country and establish its good faith before the nations of the world.

The Council adopted the draft resolution submitted by the Special Committee.

2. DANZIG.

Question of "Direct Action."

The Council on November 28th, 1932, took note of the agreement reached a few days before between Poland and Danzig,[†] and asked its President to set up a Committee of three of its members to study the question of "direct action," to hear the parties and to submit proposals with a view to adopting more satisfactory procedure in this connection.

The President, in conformity with this decision, informed the Council on December 9th that it had appointed for this purpose the representatives of the United Kingdom, Italy and Spain.

VII.—POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPEAL BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The Council on November 26th, 1932, referred to the Extraordinary Assembly the report of the Commission of Inquiry, the written observations of the Japanese Government on this report and the minutes of its meetings from November 21st to 26th.* The Special Committee of the Assembly met on December 1st and approved the convocation of the Extraordinary Assembly by its President, M. Paul Hymans. The Special Committee had before it a request from the Chinese delegation to fix the time-limit for the final report, which the Assembly had decided to prolong on July 1st. The Committee reserved its decision on this request, considering that it would be in a better position to decide the matter after the discussions of the Assembly.

The Assembly met from December 6th to 9th. It confirmed the terms of reference conferred last March on its President and the other members of the Bureau.

The general discussion was then opened, and the Chinese representative, M. Yen, made the following requests:

(1) That the Extraordinary Assembly, basing on the findings of the Commission of Inquiry, declare that Japan has violated the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Pact of Paris and the Nine-Power Treaty of Washington.

(2) That the Extraordinary Assembly call upon Japan to put into execution forthwith the Council resolutions of September 30th and December 10th, 1931, so that all Japanese troops will be withdrawn into the so-called

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 11, page 339.

[†] See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 11, page 330.

Railway Zone, pending further withdrawal therefrom, and the so-called Manchukuo Government will be dissolved.

(3) That the Extraordinary Assembly, pending the dissolution of the so-called Manchukuo Government and recalling its own resolution of March 11th wherein it pledged itself not to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League of Nations or to the Pact of Paris, declare that it will not recognise the said "Manchukuo Government" and will not enter into any relations therewith.

(4) That the Extraordinary Assembly make and publish before a definite date and within the shortest possible time a report for the final settlement of the dispute as prescribed in Article 15, paragraph 4, of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

M. Yen added that, in making these requests, the Chinese Government did not wish to preclude any last attempt on the part of the Assembly to bring about a solution on the basis of its own resolution of March 11th and the provisions of the three international instruments to which he had referred. The Chinese Government was always ready to submit observations both on the conditions recommended by the report of the Commission of Inquiry for the settlement of the dispute and on the plan of conciliation suggested therein "in the event that Japan proved that she was willing to accept conciliation on the same basis by modifying her present defiant attitude."

The Japanese representative, M. Matsuoka, declared that the whole Japanese nation looked upon Manchuria as the keystone to all questions in the Far East and considered that the recognition of the independence of Manchukuo was the only and the surest way for Japan to take in the present circumstances. The suggestions to be made by the Assembly should, in his opinion, be governed by the following principles:

1. The terms must be such that they could be effectively put into operation and that they would accomplish and preserve peace in the Far East;

2. A solution must be found for the disordered condition of China;

3. In case any plan for settlement was found by the League, that organisation must take upon itself the responsibility for its execution.

The Irish representative, Mr. Connolly, declared that the League of Nations and the Assembly ought definitely to accept the report

of the Lytton Commission and the two essential principles contained therein: (1) that a restoration of the *status quo ante* would be no solution, and (2) that the maintenance and recognition of the present régime in Manchuria would be equally unsatisfactory.

M. Benes (Czechoslovakia) said that it appeared from the present state of affairs in Manchuria and from examining the Lytton report that acts of an exceptional gravity had taken place contrary to the stipulations of the Covenant. These injustices should be repaired and in no case could they be recognised by the Members of the League. He hoped the parties would not compel the Assembly to act as a judge, but, if the Assembly was compelled to do so, it should give its opinion without hesitation. The League of Nations was essentially an institution founded on the principle of conciliation; it might agree to a compromise in order to reach some form of practical settlement, but never in respect of principles.

M. Unden (Sweden) agreed that the Assembly should adopt the conclusions of the report of the Lytton Commission, according to which recognition of the present régime in Manchuria did not appear to be compatible with existing international obligations.

M. Lange (Norway), while agreeing with M. Unden, expressed the hope that the two Governments parties to the dispute would agree to make a serious effort towards conciliation under the auspices of the League of Nations and, if necessary, with the collaboration of certain Powers non-Members of the League with important interests in the Far East.

M. de Madariaga (Spain) urged that the Assembly should not only find a solution for the Sino-Japanese dispute, but also re-establish the authority of the League and proclaim its principles.

M. Motta (Switzerland) said that, before entering upon the procedure of conciliation, the Assembly ought to determine certain fundamental data which would form the framework and a guarantee for the negotiations. Among these data were the two following points: Had Japan acted in a state of legitimate self-defence? Had the birth of the State of Manchukuo been a free and spontaneous act?

M. Politis (Greece) thought that the Assembly should lay down a certain number of fundamental ideas and in this connection he referred to the jurisprudence of the League in the matter of legitimate self-defence.

M. Matos (Guatemala) confirmed the necessity of proclaiming to all and sundry the compulsory

and intangible character of the principles of the Covenant, including respect of treaties.

M. Buero (Uruguay) recommended the constitution of a Committee of Conciliation to examine all the aspects of the dispute.

M. Paul-Boncour (France) advised the Assembly to base its conclusions on the Lytton Report in both the missions that had devolved on it: first, that of conciliation and, should conciliation be unsuccessful, the establishment of a final report in the sense of paragraph 4 of Article 15.

Sir John Simon (United Kingdom), noting that the report of the Commission of Inquiry emphasised the complexity of the problem and contained a measure of criticism of the acts of the two parties, said that if direct negotiations between the parties seemed likely to succeed, the League ought certainly to encourage them. In particular it might help in the work of conciliation by means of the Committee of Nineteen, to which might be added representatives of the two Great Powers non-Members of the League with vital interests in the Far East, namely, the United States of America and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

M. Moresco (Netherlands) insisted that the report of the Commission should serve as a basis for conciliation. Should a definite settlement not be reached, no Member of the League might recognise "Manchukuo" without infringing Article 10 of the Covenant.

M. Borberg (Denmark) agreed that the statements of the Lytton Report should form the basis for the conclusions which the Assembly would be called upon to reach in virtue of the Covenant.

Baron Aloisi (Italy) urged that the Assembly should facilitate an approach between China and Japan and at the same time recommend general co-operation between the Powers in China.

M. von Neurath (Germany) did not think that the League of Nations should deal with the affair according to more or less abstract principles, but that it should draw up a constructive plan effectively regulating the dispute. He was in favour, if need be, of securing the collaboration of the United States in the Assembly's work.

Cemal Husnu Bey (Turkey) hoped that the negotiations for conciliation would prove successful in the near future.

M. Pani (Mexico) considered that the League of Nations ought to arrive at a decision which conformed with the ideal by which the Covenant was inspired.

Count Szembeck (Poland) thought that the procedure of conciliation would be the most

appropriate means of reaching a definite settlement and guaranteeing the maintenance of peace.

M. Cahan (Canada) said that, if the Assembly was to settle the complex problem before it, it would first have to exhaust all possible means for effecting an amicable settlement by means of conciliation.

M. Garay (Panama) said that the report of the Commission of Inquiry should serve as a basis for the settlement in question; this settlement should be entrusted to a special committee.

M. Saavedra (Chile) expressed the hope that the Assembly would be able to reach a peaceful settlement by means of conciliation and by enlarging the Committee of Nineteen so as to include the representatives of the United States and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

M. Antoniadé (Roumania) said that the only possible equitable settlement would be one founded on the guiding principles of the Covenant of the League and the Pact of Paris, on which there could be no possible compromise.

General Tanczos (Hungary) announced that his country was anxious that the dispute should be settled in a way both just and practical.

Mr. Bruce (Australia) did not think that the Assembly could settle the conflict by passing a resolution expressly censuring one or other of the parties. The better method would be that of conciliation through the Committee of Nineteen, to which should be added the representatives of the United States and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

M. Guisado (Colombia) said that his country would support any settlement of the problem which conformed to the principles of the Covenant, in particular those relating to respect and maintenance of the territorial integrity of States and to respect of treaties.

M. Quo tai Chi (China), rejecting the possibility of direct negotiations with Japan, accepted Sir John Simon's proposal for conciliation. It should be made clear in advance, however, on what basis and in what direction the procedure of conciliation would develop. Among the bases of conciliation he mentioned the Assembly resolution of March 11th and the ten principles contained in Chapter IX. of the Lytton Report.

M. Matsuo (Japan) said that, generally speaking, his country was able to accept the principles put forward by the previous speakers, but it considered the measures it had taken did not run counter to them. The Japanese nation looked on Manchuria as Japan's "line of life," firstly because of its interests in that

territory, secondly because of the main lines of its policy for the maintenance of peace and order in the Far East.

The Assembly, at the end of the general discussion, in its resolution of December 9th, requested the Special Committee of Nineteen to study the report of the Commission of Inquiry, the observations of the parties and the opinions and suggestions expressed in the Assembly in whatever form submitted, and to draw up and submit, at the earliest possible moment, proposals with a view to the settlement of the dispute.

The Special Committee, which met from December 12th to 20th, and, in the absence of M. Hymans, was presided over first by M. Carton de Wiart (Belgium) and then by M. Max Huber (Switzerland), requested a drafting committee, composed of the representatives of the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and the President, to prepare texts which would give a general indication of the basis on which the work of conciliation between the parties concerned should be undertaken, and the procedure to be followed.

The drafting Committee drew up two provisional resolutions and a statement of its motives which, after approval by the Committee of Nineteen, were communicated on December 15th to the parties through the President and the Secretary-General. On December 20th the Special Committee, in view of the fact that the conversations entered into with the parties necessitated a certain length of time, decided to adjourn its meetings until January 16th at the latest.

The President of the Special Committee, M. Max Huber, declared on that occasion: "the Committee would feel that it had failed in its duty if it did not exhaust every effort for conciliation and show the utmost patience in its endeavours to reach a settlement. The problems raised by the dispute concern not only the parties themselves, not only the League as an institution, not only the Member or non-Member States individually; they affect the principles of world co-operation as a whole and the new and developing system of international relationships. The Committee sincerely believes that the two parties should be able to accept substantially the texts which it has drafted."

2. DISPUTE BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY.

The Commission of Neutrals replied on December 3rd to the telegram sent by the

Council on November 25th.* It stated that negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily and expressed the hope that it would soon be in a position to inform the Council that its efforts with a view to peace had made marked progress.

On December 6th the Acting President of the Council, Mr. Connolly (Irish Free State) proposed to his colleagues that the Council should take note of the replies from the Governments of Paraguay and Bolivia to its last communication; the Council should emphasise that it attached the greatest importance to the constitution and immediate departure to the spot of an impartial commission with wide powers.

The representative of Bolivia, M. Costa du Rels, informed his colleagues that his Government had brought to the knowledge of the Commission of Neutrals the following points which he considered were in substantial harmony with the desiderata of the Council:

1. Bolivia agreed to an immediate suspension of hostilities.
2. Bolivia agreed to the establishment of a neutralised zone within limits to be fixed in advance.
3. Bolivia agreed to the sending of a military commission of neutral officers.
4. Bolivia re-asserted her belief in the principle of arbitration, which she had been the first to uphold from the beginning of the dispute, as was proved by diplomatic papers; at the same time she stipulated categorically that the zone to be submitted to arbitral decision was to be the subject of agreements after the suspension of hostilities.
5. The statement of these points of view did not imply, and never would imply, directly or indirectly, any kind of recognition by Bolivia of Paraguay's pretensions to the territory of the Chaco between the rivers Paraguay and Pilcomayo, pending the achievement of a peaceful and definite solution.

The representative of Paraguay, M. Caballero y Bedoya, said that he would bring to the notice of his Government the communication from the President of the Council; he repeated that Paraguay was prepared to accept arbitration *in toto*.

After an exchange of observations between the representatives of Panama, Spain, Bolivia, and Paraguay, the Council approved the statement of its President.

On December 17th the Council met again and the President, Mr. Lester (Irish Free State)

* See Monthly Summary, 1932, Vol. XII, No. 11, page 333.

said he had just received a telegram from the Commission of Neutrals, dated December 16th, transmitting the copy of a cablegram which it had sent to the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay proposing that they should accept a suspension of hostilities on the basis of equitable arbitration.

The Commission of Neutrals suggested that the Governments concerned should authorise their representatives in Washington to sign immediately a convention with the following provisions: suspension of hostilities within forty-eight hours; withdrawal within forty-eight hours after the exchange of ratifications—to take place by telegraph—of the Paraguayan forces to the River Paraguay and the Bolivian forces behind a line running from Fort Bollivian to Fort Vitrones; a Commission nominated by the Commission of Neutrals should leave for the Chaco for the purpose of verifying the withdrawal of the troops; as soon as the withdrawal of the troops began, the armed forces of both countries should begin to be demobilised; the territory to the South-East of the line Bollivian-Vitrones and to the West of longitude 60° 15' West of Greenwich should be guarded by a force consisting of not more than one hundred Bolivian police; the territory to the South-East of the line in question and to the East of longitude 60° 15' West of Greenwich should be guarded by a force consisting of not more than 100 Paraguayan police; it would be understood that nothing in the Convention would in any way affect the rights of either of the two parties to the dispute; not more than fifteen days after the exchange of ratifications, the two parties should begin negotiations to determine the basis of arbitration and with a view to the constitution of the tribunal to which the case would be submitted; if these negotiations broke down, three experts appointed by the Geographical Societies of New York, London, and Madrid should establish a report relating solely to the boundaries of the Chaco; this report once made, the Court of Arbitration accepted by the two parties should make an award determining the territorial limits of the two countries in the Chaco; if, within a period of four months, the two parties failed to agree upon the Court to which the case should be submitted, it should be automatically referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice; on the exchange of the ratifications of the Convention all prisoners should be immediately released and diplomatic relations should be renewed.

In communicating these proposals, the Commission of Neutrals added that it would be

very glad if it could count upon the support of the League and suggested that the President and the Governments Members of the League should cable to the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay in support of its proposals.

The President of the Council therefore requested his colleagues to authorise him to send the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay a telegram—the text of which would also be communicated to the President of the Commission of Neutrals—calling upon these Governments to accept as quickly as possible the Convention proposed by the Commission of Neutrals. The Council approved the text of the draft telegrams and the President requested those members of the Council who had diplomatic representatives at Asuncion and La Paz to ask them to convey to the Bolivian and Paraguayan Governments the sentiments which had been expressed at its meeting.

The representatives of the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Spain declared in turn that their Governments were desirous to contribute as far as possible towards the settlement of the dispute and would not fail to send the necessary instructions to this effect to their representatives in the capitals concerned.

The Council then authorised the Secretary-General to transmit the same evening, by means of the League Wireless Station, a summary in English, French and Spanish of the Council's proceedings, so that it might be made immediately available to all Governments.

The Secretary-General emphasised the fact that the use of the League Wireless Station for the first time in this connection was exactly that for which the station had been primarily intended.

On December 20th the Paraguayan Government, replying to the Council's communication, pleaded that the very existence of Paraguay was menaced and that the country had the right, before laying down arms, to insist on preliminary conditions to assure effective security. Consequently it was not prepared to accept the suspension of hostilities unless the Chaco were evacuated, the troops disarmed and an inquiry carried out concerning the responsibility for the war. Paraguay repeated its decision to submit the substance of the dispute to international jurisdiction as soon as peace was established.

The Bolivian Government, also replying on December 20th, considered that in the replies it had previously given it had accepted in principle, subject to its reservations and remarks on the various articles, the main

points of the proposal for a convention. Nevertheless, in the light of the absolute refusal of Paraguay, it did not think it was of use to discuss any particular aspect of that proposal.

The President of the Commission of Neutrals thanked the Council on December 20th for the support it had given its proposals. On December 31st, in a telegram, he announced that Paraguay, considering that the proposals of the Commission of Neutrals did not afford a guarantee against a resumption of hostilities, insisted that Bolivia should entirely evacuate the Chaco and had just recalled its delegate on the Commission of Neutrals. In these circumstances the Commission of Neutrals had asked the four neighbouring countries of Bolivia and Paraguay what measures they would be prepared to take to prevent a fresh outbreak of hostilities. The Commission of Neutrals was convinced that if the nations of America worked together for a common agreement they would be able to safeguard peace in that hemisphere. The telegram added that the Commission would be pleased to keep the Council informed of events and to make any proposal for co-operation which might prove opportune at a later date.

3. DISPUTE BETWEEN THE UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT AND THE GOVERNMENT OF PERSIA.

The dispute between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Imperial Government of Persia concerning the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's concession was laid before the Council during its sixty-ninth session.

On December 14th the United Kingdom Government asked the Secretary-General, in virtue of Article 15 of the Covenant, to inscribe this question on the Council's agenda.

On December 16th the British Government communicated to the Secretariat a Memorandum of its views. It explained that, as a result of the disagreement between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the Persian Government concerning the method of calculating the 16% royalty due to the latter on the net profits of the undertaking, the concession granted the exploiting company had been cancelled. It recalled the vain attempts made to persuade the Persian Government to change its decision and the latter's refusal to submit the affair to the Permanent Court of International Justice. In conclusion it declared that it desired to see the present dispute settled by an amicable agreement and asked the Council to take such steps as it might consider appropriate to ensure the maintenance of the *status quo*.

On December 17th the Permanent Delegate of Persia accredited to the League of Nations sent to the Secretary-General a telegram which he had received from his Government informing him that the Persian Government had already intended to bring the dispute before the Council and that, pending an agreement with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, it had taken no steps against that Company and had no intention to do so. The Persian Government further urged that the Council should not consider the affair submitted to it until a Persian representative furnished with the necessary documents had reached Geneva.

The Acting President of the Council consequently sent the two parties the following telegram:

"Am fully confident that pending examination Council of dispute between Governments of United Kingdom and Persia concerning Anglo-Persian Oil Company, the two Governments will refrain from any act or step that might aggravate or extend the dispute."

On December 19th the Council, after hearing a statement on the present position from the President and the Secretary-General, proceeded to discuss the question.

The representative of the United Kingdom agreed that the Persian Government was entitled to a reasonable length of time in order to prepare its statement, which, it was to be hoped, would be communicated sufficiently early for the Council to examine the question at its next session.

The Persian representative explained that, owing to certain circumstances, his Government was not yet in possession of all the necessary particulars. Moreover, it had not had time to form a complete and exact idea of the reasons for which the British Government had seen fit to invoke Article 15 of the Covenant in connection with the dispute. The Persian representative emphasised that his Government was only asking for time to send as its representatives special delegates with the necessary documents and instructions. He added that his country was no less anxious than the United Kingdom to maintain the friendly relations which existed between the two countries, and by which they had been united for many years, and would do nothing to aggravate the dispute.

The President proposed to place the question on the agenda of its next session, which will begin on January 23rd.

The Council agreed to this suggestion.

VIII.—SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THE EAST.

The Committee appointed by the Council to examine the work of the Commission of Inquiry, sent to the Near, Middle and Far East to carry out an international study of the traffic in women and children, met at Geneva from December 5th to 10th under the Chairmanship of M. Regnault (France).*

This inquiry—for which the New York Bureau of Social Hygiene had generously provided the necessary funds—was to cover not only prostitutes but women taken to foreign countries as artistes, or without the pretence of filling an honourable situation, to be exploited there for purposes of prostitution.

The Commission left Marseilles on October 10th, 1931, and returned to Europe in March, 1932, after visiting the following countries: Siam, Indo-China, Hong-Kong, Macao, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan, the Netherland Indies, the Straits Settlements and the Federated and non-Federated Malay States, India, Pondicherry, Ceylon, Persia, Iraq, Syria, the Lebanon, and Palestine.

The Commission, on its arrival in each country, received an official reply in writing to the questionnaire which had been sent in advance. These replies were accompanied by statistics and other documents, such as the laws and regulations in force in the territories.

In each country the Commission took steps to collect information from official and private sources. This information was provided by police officials, officials of the social welfare, health, labour, and education departments, by judges, jurists, doctors, officials of charitable organisations, and representatives of religious communities (Churches and Missionary Societies).

The Commission published in the papers of

all the towns visited a concise statement on the object of the inquiry and an account of the international co-operation undertaken with a view to suppressing the traffic in women and children. Any individual person or organisation with information to supply was asked to get into touch with it.

On the basis of the material and information thus collected, the Commission drew up a detailed report in which it reviewed the position in the various countries and made suggestions for reinforcing the campaign against the traffic.

These suggestions have been examined by the Committee, which heard the representatives of China, Persia, the Netherlands, and Portugal, who made observations and brought additional information to bear on the part of the report of direct interest to themselves.

The Committee made a certain number of changes in the report and adopted its conclusions. It decided to submit the report to the Council with the recommendation that the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People should be asked to consider what steps should be taken to carry out the suggestions of the Commission of Inquiry.

The following took part in the Committee's work: Dr. Gertrud Baumer (Germany); M. Gaston Bourgois (France); M. Chodzko (Poland); M. Adolfo Sienra (Uruguay); Dr. Celestino Frigerio (Italy); Dona Christina Giustiniani Bandini (Italy); M. Kusama (Japan); Mlle. Martha S. Malthé (Denmark); M. Isidore Maus (Belgium); Don Vicente Palmaroli y Reboulet (Spain); M. Regnault (France); Mme. Hélène Romnicio (Romania); Sir Henry Wheeler (United Kingdom), and the following members of the Travelling Commission: Mr. Bascom Johnson, Dr. Sundquist, and M. Pindor.

IX.—INTERNAL ORGANISATION QUESTIONS.

APPOINTMENT OF THE NEW SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE.

The Council on October 17th, 1932, appointed M. Joseph Avenol to succeed Sir Eric Drummond as Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as the resignation of the latter became effective,† and the Assembly on December 9th

was invited to give its opinion on this appointment in virtue of Article 6 of the Covenant. Article 6 provides that the Secretary-General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

The appointment of M. Avenol by the Council was duly ratified by the Assembly.

The President of the Extraordinary Assembly, M. Paul Hymans, said it was the first time the Assembly had been called upon to apply the

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. X., No. 5, page 106.

† See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 303.

provisions laid down in the Covenant for electing a Secretary-General of the League. Only a simple majority was required, but M. Avenol had been elected almost unanimously:

"That is, therefore, a spontaneous mark of confidence from almost all the delegations representing States Members of the League of Nations, in a man who for years has devoted all his talent and all his activities to our work. M. Avenol was first a member of the Financial Committee, and he gave us very efficient service towards the financial reconstruction of certain States. He always acted to the point and was always listened to with deference. . . ."

Referring to the departure of Sir Eric Drummond, the President recalled the words of M. Titulesco on a former occasion: "Our Secretary-General is an article of the Covenant." He then continued as follows:

"The value of institutions depends upon the value of the men in charge of them. Sir Eric Drummond was one of those who built and who inspired the League of Nations. We must pay a tribute to him and thank him. He knows that this manifestation of our feelings is not the last we shall make to him, and I trust that he feels that we cannot leave each other without instinctively coming back and stretching our hands towards each other."

The Assembly adopted a resolution submitted by a large number of delegations expressing its gratitude for the inestimable service Sir Eric Drummond had rendered to the League, and declaring that he had deserved well of the League's ideal of justice and peace. It was decided that, in order to perpetuate among the nations the memory of the distinguished personality of the first Secretary-General of the League of Nations, a portrait of Sir Eric Drummond should be placed in the Palace of the League at the moment of its inauguration.

Various speakers, M. Matos (Guatemala), M. Politis (Greece), Sir John Simon (United Kingdom) congratulated Sir Eric Drummond on the way in which he had carried out his heavy task, and expressed once more the unanimous regret of the member States at his resignation.

Sir Eric Drummond thanked the Assembly, recalling his fourteen years of service to the League, and expressing his faith in its future:

"In spite of crises, in spite of criticism, I am convinced that the League is far stronger to-day than it was when that bold and untried experiment was first undertaken. It is true that the League has not altogether fulfilled the hopes of its keenest supporters, but it has undoubtedly belied the predictions of its enemies who foretold that in a troubled world its early demise was certain."

M. Avenol, thanking the Assembly for the

confidence it had shown him, continued as follows:

"I regard it as a happy augury that I should receive my investiture at the hands of one who presided at the first Assembly of the League of Nations, who was one of its founders. . . . In ratifying the unanimous decision of the Council you have done me the signal honour of entrusting me with the great and important task assigned under the Covenant to your Secretary-General. In the hope that I shall derive from the confidence shown in me to-day the courage to fulfil this task, I accept it, fully alive to its importance, and am prepared wholly to devote myself to it.

If I may interpret the reasons for your decision, I am perhaps not wrong in thinking that one of the first of these is your desire to ensure continuity in the organisation which Sir Eric Drummond has founded and inspired, and for the main lines of which he is responsible.

After ten years of the closest co-operation with him, I shall, in taking up my new duties, feel, more perhaps than anyone else, the loss of his guidance and unparalleled experience.

Amongst the considerations which, according to the Preamble, inspire the provisions of the Covenant, there is one which I should like, if I may be so permitted, to take as my constant precept and, indeed, as the guiding principle of the Secretariat's life and being: 'The prescription of open, just, and honourable relations between nations.'

* * *

M. Joseph Avenol was born on June 9th, 1879, at La Melle (Department of Deux-Sèvres).

Inspector and then Inspector-General of Finance, he was the French Government's financial representative in London from 1916 to 1923, and in 1919 took part in the work of the Supreme Economic Council.

Expert and delegate at the Conferences of London, San Remo, Hythe, Spa, Boulogne, Brussels, Cannes, and Genoa, he was member of the Financial Committee of the League of Nations from 1920 to 1923. In this capacity he was especially concerned with the financial restoration of Austria.

Since January, 1923, as Deputy-Secretary-General of the League of Nations in charge of the Technical Organisations, he has carried out numerous missions in Central and Eastern Europe and in the Far East.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO UNDER-SECRETARIES-GENERAL.

During its sixty-ninth session the Council appointed two Under-Secretaries-General, M. Trendelenburg and M. Pilotti, to replace M. Dufour-Féronce and the Marquis Paulucci di Calboli Barone.

Before taking up their posts the two new Under-Secretaries-General made the declaration

of loyalty in the presence of the Council, approved by the Assembly in September, 1932.*

* * *

M. Massimo Pilotti.

Born at Rome on August 1st, 1879.

Doctor of Law; called to the Bar in 1901; Counsellor of the Court of Cassation in 1926; First President of the Court of Appeal in 1930.

From 1919 he was member of the Italian delegation at all the international conferences: Paris 1919, Spa-Brussels 1920, London 1924, Locarno 1925, the Hague 1929-1930, London 1930, Geneva and Lausanne 1932.

Legal Adviser to the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1927, delegate to the Assemblies of the League of Nations from 1924.

President in 1925 of the Coblenz Arbitral Commission responsible for estimating the value of payments in kind made under Articles 8 to 12 of the Rhine Agreement; President in 1931 of the Permanent Legal Committee of the Advisory and Technical Commission for Communications and Transit; Chairman of the Special Com-

mittee for Chemical and Bacterial Weapons of the Disarmament Conference.

Dr. Ernst Trendelenburg.

Born at Rostock (Mecklenburg) on February 13th, 1882.

Doctor of Law; entered the Reich Department of Justice in 1908; was transferred later to the Department of the Interior; appointed Privy Councillor to the Reich Ministry of Economy in 1918; Commissioner of the Reich for the Regulation of Imports and Exports 1919 to 1922; Director in the Reich Ministry of Economy 1922; Secretary of State in the same Ministry at the end of the same year; President of the German delegation in the Franco-German negotiations 1924-1925; member of the Economic Committee of the League of Nations 1926; delegate at the World Economic Conference 1927; President of the Economic Committee of the League of Nations 1929; Member of the Reich Economic Council; Senator of the *Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft für Förderung der Wissenschaft*.

X.—PUBLICATIONS OF THE LEAGUE.

REVIEW OF WORLD TRADE 1931 AND 1932. (FIRST HALF.)

A general review of world trade for 1931 and the first six months of 1932 has just been published by the League.

This review gives a detailed analysis of the nature and causes for the decline in world trade which has fallen at a steadily increasing rate. In 1930 the value of world trade in terms of gold was 19% lower than in 1929; the following year there was a further reduction of 28% in relation to the 1930 figure; during the first six months of 1932 a fall of 33% occurred as compared with the first six months of 1931.

The Review shows that, during the three years 1930 to 1932, the heavy fall in the price of goods was accompanied by a swift contraction in the volume of trade. On the average prices fell by 50%, while the quantum of trade decreased by 7% in 1930, 9% in 1931 and 12% for the first half of 1932, as compared with the similar period in 1931. As the quantum of foodstuffs in international trade had somewhat increased, this fall was due solely to reduced trade in other products and, in particular, manufactured products.

Countries producing foodstuffs and raw materials suffered especially from this state of

affairs, since the greatest fall occurred in the price of their export articles. On the assumption that the average fall in prices has been about 50%, the prices of articles such as rubber, wheat, maize, coffee and wool have fallen well below the average, while those of other manufactured articles and certain materials used in industrial production—cement, construction steel and cast-iron—although considerably lower, have remained above that average.

On the other hand, the export industries of industrial countries have suffered badly as a result of the decrease in purchasing power of the agricultural countries. Quantitative import restrictions, under quota systems and exchange control, have also proved prejudicial to world trade.

The Review shows that the United States have been affected more seriously by the depression than the other large commercial countries. Their trade figures have fallen by 67%, whereas in Germany they have fallen by 60%, in the United Kingdom by 57% and in France by 54%.

The chapter devoted to the movement of the balance of trade in a large number of countries shows the way the decrease in world trade has aggravated the financial crisis.

The Review contains a revised and completed table of price and quantum indices of

* See Monthly Summary, Vol. XII., No. 10, page 317.

imports and exports from thirty important countries, representing three-quarters of the world trade during 1924 to 1931. It gives a detailed statement on the commercial situation of the principal countries of the world and various smaller characteristic countries.

The conclusion to be drawn from the statis-

tical examination of the present state of world trade is that a "continued disorganisation of trade at the same rapid pace as in the last three years will very soon lead to a state where the national income of certain countries will no longer maintain the already low standard of living of their population."

XI.—FORTHCOMING EVENTS.

January 16th.—Sub-Committee on the Re-organisation of the Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People, Geneva.

January 16th.—Committee of Nineteen, Geneva.

January 19th.—Legal Sub-Committee set up to consider the proposed amendments to the Protocol to be added to the Convention on the White Slave Traffic, Geneva.

January 20th.—Committee to establish procedure concerning "Direct action" in Danzig-Polish affairs, Geneva.

January 23rd.—Seventieth Session of the Council, Geneva.

January 23rd.—Bureau of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Geneva.

January 24th.—Intergovernmental Advisory Committee on Refugees, Geneva.

January 25th.—Permanent Central Opium Board, Geneva.

January 26th.—Organising Committee of the Council for the Monetary and Economic Conference, Geneva.

January 30th.—Committee to study the existing system of Election to the Council, Geneva.

January 31st.—General Commission of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Geneva.

February 6th. — Supervisory Commission, Geneva.

May ?.—Monetary and Economic Conference, London.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

1. CASE CONCERNING THE LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF EASTERN GREENLAND (DENMARK-NORWAY).*

After the conclusion of the Danish first statement, the Court, in the course of public sittings held on December 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 12th, 13th and 14th, heard the first statement on behalf of the Norwegian Government presented by MM. Rygh, Sunde and Gidel.

On December 8th the Court decided :

(1) To adjourn the hearings in this case after the conclusion of the Norwegian first statement.

(2) To resume these hearings on January 16th, 1933, in order to hear the oral reply to be presented on behalf of Denmark and the oral rejoinder to be presented on behalf of Norway.

(3) At the conclusion of the Danish reply, to grant Norway the necessary time for the preparation and presentation of her oral rejoinder, having due regard to the period of time which Denmark had had for the preparation of her reply.

In accordance with this decision, the hearings in this case were adjourned on December 14th.

2. CASE CONCERNING THE PRINCE OF PLESS ADMINISTRATION (GERMANY-POLAND).

The Court continued its deliberation on the

preliminary objection raised by the Polish Government.

3. CASES CONCERNING THE LEGAL STATUS OF CERTAIN PARTS OF SOUTH-EAST GREENLAND (NORWAY-DENMARK; DENMARK-NORWAY).

At the request of the Norwegian Government—in which request the Danish Government in principle concurred—the Court, on December 16th, 1932, made an Order extending the time-limits for the filing of the cases and counter-cases. The new time-limits are fixed as follows :

For the filing of a case by each Party : April 1st, 1933.

For the filing of a counter-case by each Party : May 15th, 1933.

In the same Order, the Court says that it will, if necessary, subsequently fix the time-limits for the submission of written replies and rejoinders, if any.

4. COMPOSITION OF THE CHAMBER FOR SUMMARY PROCEDURE FOR 1933.

On December 16th, 1932, the Court constituted the Chamber for Summary Procedure, as follows :

Members : MM. Adatci (President), Guerrero, Sir Cecil Hurst.

Substitute Members : Count Rostworowski, M. Anzilotti.

* See Monthly Summary, 1932, Vol. XII., No. 11, page 478.

ANNEX I.

PROPOSALS OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

The Japanese Government, anxious for the realisation of the project of disarmament, whereby the peace of the world is to be consolidated, have been doing their utmost, in co-operation with other Powers concerned, to contribute to the success of the present Disarmament Conference. Paying sincere respect to the initiative taken by the participating Powers, particularly by President Hoover and the British Government, in putting proposals before the Conference, the Japanese Government have given careful consideration to those proposals. Having found, however, that these proposals contain certain points with which the Japanese Government cannot associate themselves, they wish to submit their point of view in so far as the problem of naval disarmament is concerned.

It is the earnest desire of the Japanese Government that, for the purpose of qualitative and quantitative reduction of naval armaments, the following should be observed by the present Conference as its guiding principle: that the Conference, always relying on the basis of the three important resolutions adopted by the General Commission in the early stages of the Conference—viz., those embodying the principle of reduction of armaments, the criteria for the limitation and reduction of armaments and the principle of qualitative disarmament—should seek to reduce those forces which are aggressive in character and strong in offensive power, and to find a fair and rational solution of the problem in such a way as to meet existing conditions, giving due consideration to the geographical situation and special circumstances of the various countries, so that the sense of security may not be impaired.

For the success of the Conference, the most careful attention should be given to the procedure to be followed in its future discussions. It is believed to be practically impossible for a World Conference such as the present one to seek to conclude a comprehensive agreement at a single stroke by having all the participating Powers take part in the discussion of every problem regardless of whether it is of minor importance or of concern to only some of those Powers. Such a method would rather jeopardise the chance of ultimate success. In the future discussions of naval questions, therefore, and with a view to realising the guiding principle set forth above, to facilitating the progress of the Conference, and to assuring the attainment of its object, the Japanese Government propose, as a practical and effective procedure, that:

(1) The general outline of agreements to be concluded shall form the subject-matter of prior negotiations between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, as was contemplated by the resolution of the General Commission on July 23rd;

(2) The agreements shall be of two kinds—general and special. Discussions on matters of a general character will be followed by discussions on matters of a sectional and detailed nature;

(3) A distinction shall be made between powerful naval vessels, which possess a high degree of relativity as between Powers, and less powerful vessels, which, having a close relation to geographical situation and special circumstances, are primarily necessary for defence and patrol services; in other words, such vessels as capital ships, aircraft-carriers and A-class cruisers on the one hand, and such vessels as B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines on the other, shall be dealt with separately.

In the general agreement, qualitative limitation of all categories of naval vessels and quantitative limitation between the five leading naval Powers of capital ships, aircraft-carriers and A-class cruisers are to be effected so that the offensive power of these vessels will be greatly reduced; and the maximum tonnages, applying uniformly to the afore-mentioned five Powers, for B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines respectively shall be fixed.

In the special agreements, quantitative reduction to be applied mainly to B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines shall be effected within each group of Powers most closely related, taking into account their geographical situation and special circumstances.

The Japanese Government think that the method outlined above should prove to be the most practical way to obtain a fair and equitable agreement.

A. GENERAL AGREEMENT.

It is the purpose of this agreement to provide for qualitative limitation of naval vessels of all countries, together with a quantitative limitation between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, of vessels having a great offensive power and to fix the maximum tonnages, applying uniformly to the said five Powers, for B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines respectively.

1. Reduction in the unit size of the various naval vessels and the calibre of the guns shall be agreed upon.

2. The reduction and limitation of the tonnages of capital ships, aircraft-carriers and A-class cruisers of the above-mentioned five Powers shall be agreed upon.

3. The maximum tonnages, applying uniformly to the five naval Powers, for B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines respectively shall be agreed upon in the general agreement. The actual tonnages of these vessels to be retained by the five Powers shall, however, be fixed as low as possible within the above-mentioned maximum, by means of special agreements, between the Powers in the respective groups to which the said five Powers belong, taking the tonnages actually possessed by each Power as a basis and also bearing in mind the geographical situation and special circumstances of each country concerned.

4. As for the tonnages of the Powers other than the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, it shall be agreed in the general agreement that they shall be limited and reduced by means of the special agreements, upon the basis of the actual tonnages of the Powers and with due regard to their geographical situation and special circumstances.

B. SPECIAL AGREEMENTS.

For the purpose of these agreements, the world shall be divided broadly into the Pacific, Atlantic, European and South-American groups, and the limitation and reduction of the tonnages to be actually retained by a country shall be agreed upon between that country and other countries of the same group on the basis of the provisions embodied in the general agreement. (As for the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, the special agreements apply to the tonnages of B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines.) A country which is closely related to more than one group shall participate in the negotiation of the agreement of each of those groups.

Throughout the discussions of the Conference in the first six months, the most important point unanimously agreed upon was the principle of qualitative limitation, which was adopted with the basic idea in mind of strengthening defensive power by weakening offensive power.

Having this end in view, the Japanese Government urge, first of all, the total abolition of aircraft-carriers, which were admitted by a great majority of the members of the technical Commissions to be most offensive, most efficacious against national defence, and most threatening to civilian populations. The Japanese Government also urge the reduction in the unit size of all categories of naval vessels, especially that of capital ships and A-class cruisers.

In view of the fact that the basic idea referred to above of strengthening defensive power by weakening offensive power necessarily demands a larger sacrifice on the part of larger navies in comparison with that of smaller navies, the former should be prepared to take the lead in larger reductions than the latter. To apply the same percentage of reduction to both large and small navies alike would naturally impair the sense of national security of countries with lesser navies, and this sense of security will diminish as the measure of reduction is increased. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that, in effecting the reduction in the tonnages of vessels possessing a high degree of relativity as between Powers, such as capital ships and A-class cruisers, the above consideration of national security should be taken into account in order that lesser naval Powers may not be disturbed in this regard. B class cruisers and destroyers, having no great offensive power, are less important in the consideration of relativity. The tonnages required by each Power should therefore be determined primarily by the needs of that Power in view of its geographical situation and with due regard to the function of these types of vessels in coastal defence and protection of lines of communication in war-time, and for patrol and similar services in time of peace. Submarines, as was recognised by a large majority of the members of the Naval Commission, are of defensive and not offensive character. The degree of their relativity as between Powers is extremely slight, and they constitute an arm indispensable for the defence of a lesser naval Power. The required tonnage should be determined, therefore, solely by the geographical situation and defensive needs of each country.

In short, the greatest importance should be attached to considerations of the geographical situation and special circumstances of each country in determining the tonnages of B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines. The Japanese Government therefore propose that the actual tonnages of these vessels to be retained by the various Powers be determined by means of special agreements, and that the uniform maximum tonnages acceptable to all the Powers, for these three types of vessels, be stipulated in the general agreement.

In pursuance of the above considerations, the Japanese Government wish to put forward the following concrete proposal for the general agreement:

1. The maximum unit size and gun-calibre of vessels to be constructed in the future shall be reduced and limited as follows:

Type	Tonnage	Gun-calibre
Capital ship	25,000	14 inches (355 mm.)
A-class cruiser	8,000	8 inches (203 mm.)
B-class cruiser	6,000	6.1 inches (155 mm.)
Destroyer (including flotilla leader) ..	1,500	5.1 inches (130 mm.)
Submarine	1,800	5.1 inches (130 mm.)

Aircraft-carriers shall be abolished, prohibiting at the same time the construction of aircraft landing platforms or decks on naval vessels.

2. The strength of the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan in capital ships and A-class cruisers shall be reduced to the following figures :

Capital Ships.

					Tonnage	Number of units
United States	275,000	11
British Empire	275,000	11
Japan	200,000	8

For France and Italy, the maximum tonnage shall be fixed at 150,000 (number of units, not fixed) ; and within that limit the actual tonnage to be allowed each Power shall be agreed upon between the Powers concerned.

A-class Cruisers.

					Tonnage	Number of units
United States	96,000	12
British Empire	96,000	12
Japan	80,000	10

For France and Italy, the maximum tonnage shall be fixed at 56,000 (number of units, 7) ; and within that limit the actual tonnage to be allowed each Power shall be agreed upon between the Powers concerned.

3. The maximum tonnages, applying uniformly to the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan for B-class cruisers, destroyers and submarines shall be fixed as follows :

Type									Tonnage
B-class cruiser	150,000
Destroyer	150,000
Submarine	75,000

The proposal of the Japanese Government, based as it is upon the principles of disarmament, which have received the approval of the public opinion of the entire world, offers, in their opinion, a fair, reasonable and practical solution of the problems of naval disarmament. In putting forward this proposal, the Japanese Government wish to make it clear that they are animated by the sincere desire to facilitate the successful conclusion of the Conference. It is submitted, not only with the hope that the other naval Powers will encounter no difficulty in accepting it, but with the firm conviction that it will effect an enormous reduction in expenditures on armament that now weigh heavily upon the peoples of the world, and that it will lead the way toward the consolidation of a lasting world peace.

ANNEX II.

A SUMMARY OF THE CHINESE COMMENTS ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY AND ON THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE JAPANESE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL.*

The document in question was presented by the Chinese Delegation on December 3rd, 1932, to the Secretary-General for circulation to the Members of the Council and of the Assembly, for the purpose of setting forth supplementary views and comments on the Japanese observations and statements, in addition to those which the Chinese representative had presented at the meetings of the Council on November 21st, 23rd and 24th, 1932. Besides some introductory remarks, the document was divided into six parts, namely : (a) Conditions in China and Japan ; (b) Chinese nationalism and the so-called "anti-foreignism" ; (c) China's Three Eastern Provinces (Manchuria) ; (d) The incident of September 18th and the question of self-defence ; (e) "Manchukuo" ; and (f) Concluding remarks.

CONDITIONS IN CHINA AND JAPAN.

In endeavouring to show that the criticism of the Japanese representative about conditions in China was not well founded in fact, the Chinese document, among other things, referred to a statement made by Mr. Ariyoshi, Japanese Minister to China, to the Japanese journalists at Shanghai, on November 21st, 1932, in which he said :

There is a great deal of talk about dismemberment of China and the continual development of civil troubles, but it is absolutely impossible to believe that General Chiang Kai-shek can possibly lose control of the situation. He has made a vigorous and energetic attack against communism, and the Government in all its administrative departments is thoroughly united in its politics and in its programme. Consequently, there is not any reason whatever to expect the fall of General Chiang Kai-shek or the Central Government.

The Chinese document then went on to point out that in contrast with China's internal conditions, it was Japan's policy of expansion and conquest as sponsored and carried out by her militarists that

* The above is the text of the summary of the Chinese observations on the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, the publication of which was announced in the last number of the *Monthly Summary*.

was the underlying cause of the reign of terror, financial stress and social unrest in Japan to-day. As the whole country was in the grip of the military chiefs, there existed in Japan such a reign of terror that in the nine months August, 1931, to May, 1932, four of her most prominent political leaders were killed by bands of assassins. Again, the effects on Japan of her military aggression in Manchuria and in China Proper were shown by the fact that there appeared in her budget for 1932-33 a deficit of nearly 900 million yen, or more than 40 per cent. of the total budgeted expenditure, and that the Japanese yen depreciated in value by at least 60 per cent.

CHINESE NATIONALISM AND THE SO-CALLED "ANTI-FOREIGNISM."

It was emphasised that there was no anti-foreign sentiment in China, and that if such sentiment appeared to prevail vis-à-vis Japan, it was she who, by her own acts of aggression towards China, was responsible for its emergence as a natural reaction.

The document then proceeded to explain that the growth of nationalism in China and the echoes of the shibboleth of revolutionary diplomacy in recent years merely symbolised the re-awakening of a virile national sentiment in China in favour of a definite programme for the attainment of her rightful position in the family of nations; and that Japan, as well as the countries in America and Europe, had on more than one occasion officially expressed approval of this legitimate aspiration, the latest instance being a statement made by Baron Shidehara on January 22nd, 1931, in which he reiterated the determination of his Government to co-operate with China in a friendly and constructive manner for the solution of the latter's problems which would ultimately result in the relinquishment by the Powers of their special rights and privileges. What Japan to-day was severely criticising as the anti-foreign policy of the Chinese Government, it was pointed out, was none other than that which simply aimed at the eventual restoration to China by negotiation and agreement of the special rights and privileges conferred on foreign nationals nearly a century ago and generally considered as derogatory to her sovereignty.

Reference was then made to certain anti-foreign incidents in Japan in the past, in contrast with which the popular movement in China to emancipate her from the one-sided restrictions on her political, administrative and jurisdictional freedom was said to have been characterised by singular restraint and moderation. It was a striking fact that Japan, instead of profiting by her own experience in this respect and manifesting sympathy for China in her task of reintegrating her sovereignty, should be the first country to misinterpret the legitimate aspirations of the Chinese people and to oppose their full realisation by attributing to them "xenophobia" and "anti-foreignism," thereby misleading world opinion.

On the question of boycott, it was explained that if the Chinese Government felt it necessary, as on the present occasion, to adopt special measures in view of the popular and spontaneous manifestations of indignation aroused by the anti-Chinese riots in Korea and intensified by the subsequent Japanese invasion of Manchuria, this was done out of a desire to guide the movement within lawful bounds and to ensure more effectively the safety of Japanese nationals. It was certainly due to this special precaution that only few local incidents had taken place in comparison with the appalling loss of Chinese lives and destruction of Chinese property in Korea, in the Chinese Three Eastern Provinces, and in other parts of China, all as a result of Japanese negligence or aggression.

With reference to the question of responsibility, it was contended that if boycott entailed state responsibility, it certainly rested with Japan, the aggressor, and not with China, the victim of Japanese aggression, the reason given being that to hold China responsible for the effect of the boycott vis-à-vis Japan would not only be mistaking the result for the cause but also adding injustice to the wrong and injury to which China had been subjected for the past fifteen months.

CHINA'S THREE EASTERN PROVINCES (MANCHURIA).

It was stated in the Chinese document that "Manchuria, which is known in China as the Three Eastern Provinces, is historically, racially, culturally and politically an integral part of China." In order to refute the Japanese argument that Manchuria "was distinctly and almost exclusively a Crown domain or a private estate appanage of the Manchu dynasty up to the present century," it was pointed out that even before the establishment of the Chinese Republic, the Three Eastern Provinces were placed upon the same footing as other provinces in China Proper and were governed or administered in much the same way as the latter. Moreover, the Imperial Edict of Abdication of February 12th, 1912, itself expressly and formally confirmed the fact that the Republic of China comprised the territories of the Ta Tsing Empire by enforcing the "union of all the territories of the five races of Manchus, Chinese, Mongols, Mohammedans and Tibetans into a great Republic of China." The Provisional Constitution of the Republic of 1912, too, in Article 3, expressly provided that "the territory of the Republic of China consists of the twenty-two Provinces," and the same or similar provision was to be found in the later constitutions.

It was also stated that "internationally Manchuria has always been and is recognised as an integral part of China," and that this fundamental fact had never been contested by any country including Japan either since or before the establishment of the Republic in 1912, until to-day when Japan had begun to deny it.

The claim of Japan to a "special position" in Manchuria was characterised as a mere cloak for her traditional policy of expansion and conquest on the Asiatic mainland; it had never been and was not admitted by China or understood by the other Powers.

THE INCIDENT OF SEPTEMBER 18TH AND THE QUESTION OF SELF-DEFENCE.

The Japanese argument of self-defence in connection with the events on and since September 18th 1931, had as its basis, among other things, the French reservation to the Pact of Paris to the effect that "each country should retain the right of legitimate defence," as well as the standard case of the *Caroline*.

In connection with the said French reservation, reference was made to the remarks contained in a speech delivered by Mr. Kellogg on April 29th, 1928, before the American International Law Association at Washington, in which he said that "if it has a good case, the world will applaud and not condemn its action," and that "it is not in the interest of peace that a treaty should stipulate a juristic conception of self-defence, since it is far too easy for the unscrupulous to mould events to accord with an agreed definition." Again, in the report of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 14th, 1929, it was stated that "the treaty in brief pledges the nations bound by the same not to resort to war in the settlement of their international controversies save in *bona fide* self-defence." Lastly, Mr. Stimson, in an address before the Council on Foreign Relations on August 8th, 1932, said: "The limits of self-defence have been clearly defined by countless precedents. . . . A nation which sought to mask imperialistic policy under the guise of the defence of its nationals would soon be unmasked." Measured by this standard, and in view of the finding in the Lytton report that "the military operations of the Japanese troops during this night . . . cannot be regarded as measures of legitimate self-defence," one could easily judge for oneself whether or not Japan had a good case of *bona fide* self-defence.

As regards the case of the *Caroline*, it was hardly applicable to the present dispute between China and Japan. In that case, the invasion of American territorial waters by Canada appeared to have been acquiesced in by the United States Government because they were satisfied that there was "a necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation." In the case of the September 18th incident, there clearly existed no necessity of self-defence of this description. Even supposing that the alleged railroad explosion actually occurred on the night of that date, it was stated in the report in unmistakable terms that "the damage, if any, to the railroad did not in fact prevent the punctual arrival of the southbound train from Changchun and was not in itself sufficient to justify military action."

A quotation was then given from a speech made by Professor Kisaburo Yokota, of the Tokio Imperial University, on October 15th, 1931, in the course of which he said:

Granted the destruction of railroad track is a cause of grievance, the proper action to take in self-defence would be a counter-attack on the intruding soldiers. Or the most that the Japanese army could do, still in the name of self-defence, would be the occupation of Peitaying (North Barracks). But in the course of the advance on Peitaying there was almost a simultaneous attack on Mukden city. Can such an act be styled as self-defence? Moreover, within six hours following the railway Blow-up (10.30 p.m. September 18th), Kwanchengtze, some 400 kilometers to the north, was taken (4.40 a.m. September 19th); Yinkow, 200 kilometers to the south, was also occupied by Japanese troops (5 a.m. same day). How can these facts reconcile with the professed motive for action, self-defence?"

It was also added that the salient features in the case of the *Caroline* were that the English force was withdrawn after having set adrift the steamer in question down the Falls of Niagara and that subsequently the British Government apologised for the violation of American territorial sovereignty.

The conclusion from the foregoing account was that the statement of the Japanese Government that the military "operations had no relation to anything but self-defence" and that the Japanese Government "are conscious of never having transgressed the due limits of the right of self-defence" was entirely misleading and could not be justified in international law or in international practice.

"MANCHUKUO."

With reference to "Manchukuo," the Chinese document stated that it was conclusively proved by the report of the Commission that this puppet régime, far from being the expression of the free will of the people of Manchuria, was an artificial creation of the Japanese officials and was controlled by them.

Referring to the Japanese interpretation of the phrase "*Paoching Anmin*" as being the embodiment of a movement for "Manchuria for the Manchurians," it was made clear that this phrase simply meant "protect our area and ensure peace to the inhabitants." It was a political slogan frequently employed in different parts of China to indicate the adoption of a policy on the part of the authorities concerned to keep aloof from any civil strife that might be raging in their neighbourhood. The area might be a city, or a district, or a province, or a group of provinces. The interpretation given by the Japanese was therefore a far-fetched one.

Of the supposed leaders of the movement for independence, it was pointed out that Wang Yung-chiang had been dead for over three years; that Yu Chung-han, because of his close association with the Japanese in a variety of business and industrial enterprises, was never entirely free from Japanese influence and pressure; and that while Chao Hsin-po and others might in their opposition to the policy of General Chang Hsueh-liang desire to effect reforms in Manchuria, such could not be interpreted as the desire to create a new state separate from China.

Again, of the so-called Chinese personages of high standing alleged to be in favour of local, provincial and state independence, practically none was really in sympathy with the Japanese inspired and controlled movement to establish a new, independent state.

For example, Yuan Ching-kai, Chairman of the Mukden Committee of Peace and Order which was established after the events of September 18th, in an interview with Reiji Hirano, a correspondent of the *Central Review* (a Japanese periodical in Tokio) stated :

As the situation was urgent and critical, I felt in duty bound to devote all my energy to the maintenance of peace and order in the Province of Liaoning. On the other hand, I do not entertain any idea as to the suggestion for the unification of the north-eastern provinces, nor do I have any knowledge about the selection of Henry Puyi to govern these four provinces, although a rumour to that effect is gaining currency.

Tsang Shih-yi, Governor of Liaoning Province before September 18th, 1931, was put under military surveillance on the morrow of the Japanese attack, when he refused to make a declaration of independence as asked by the Japanese. He was removed to, and imprisoned in, General Bao's house for three months and was released only when he consented to serve as the head of the new provincial government of Liaoning. Yet in his speech of inauguration, on December 15th, 1931, not a word was said about the establishment of a new state. His significant words were :

As to the Sino-Japanese relations, the Three Eastern Provinces are more intimately concerned with them. I shall exert my best efforts to promote friendliness between China and Japan.

In practically all the proclamations of the Chinese authorities issued before Japan's artificial creation of the "Manchukuo," the purpose was clearly stated to be the maintenance of local peace and order. This was no less true of the proclamation which General Hsi Hsia was compelled to issue in the city of Kirin on September 26th, 1931, when his troops had been disarmed by Japanese troops in command of General Tamon and when Japanese flags had been hoisted by the latter on the Chinese official buildings.

Referring to the "Self-Government Guiding Board," which, in the words of the Commission's report, was the "chief agency in bringing about independence," it was stated in the Japanese Observations that this board was under the management of a Chinese and that the Fourth Department of the Kwantung Army Headquarters had no connection whatever with the Self-Government Guiding Board. It was pointed out in the Chinese statement, however, that of the thirteen principal officers of this board, twelve were Japanese. Although the nominal chairman was Yu Chung-han, a Chinese, the real head was Nakano, who was at the same time the Chief of the Political Department of the Kwantung Army Headquarters. As a proof of the fact that the Self-Government Guiding Board was entirely controlled by the Japanese in spite of its Chinese chairman, it was noted that the sixty-four guiding officers despatched by the board to the thirty-two districts of Liaoning Province, being two for each district, were all Japanese.

In order to show that the idea of establishing the "Manchukuo" was first conceived and propagated by the Japanese, several quotations were made from the utterances of certain Japanese statesmen and soldiers. For example, in his proclamation of October 4th, 1931, General Honjo said in part :

But, on the other hand, if the thirty million inhabitants of Manchuria and Mongolia desire to make of these regions a land of happiness in which to live and prosper, they will have the heartiest sympathy of the Army whose only wish is that this unification be speedily accomplished. Such a scheme, which is entirely compatible with our "kingly doctrine," is, in fact, an urgent measure for our Empire in order to establish friendly relations with our neighbours and build up a sure foundation for eternal peace in "Eastern Ocean." It is obvious that all nations of the world, in their love of justice and for the sake of the welfare of these thirty million inhabitants, will not hesitate to lend them their assistance.

At a meeting of the leading Japanese statesmen, held on December 5th, 1931, at the Terkoku Hotel at Tokio to discuss the situation in Manchuria, Koku Mori, then Secretary General of the Inukai cabinet and chief secretary of the Seiyukai party, remarked :

In regard to the Manchurian and Mongolian question, since the Japanese nation has made up her mind, there is no longer any necessity for maintaining a secretive attitude towards other nations of the world. . . . From now on, we cannot countenance the establishment there of any political power which may be in opposition to the mission of the Japanese or which may originate from China Proper.

At the same meeting, Colonel Yasunosuke Sato was even more explicit and emphatic. He said :

Our soldiers and officers who have been despatched to Manchuria are unanimously of the opinion that, unless Manchuria is totally detached from China Proper, it will be tantamount to restoring the *status quo ante* and thus setting at naught all the efforts and sacrifices made by the Japanese troops since the outbreak of the September incident. . . . If we could all be given sufficient time in which to continue our financial and military assistance to those now in Manchuria, there might be hope of attaining success.

Criticism was made in the Japanese Observations that not sufficient attention had been paid to the Japanese "account of the successive demonstrations in favour of the independence which

took place in the various districts throughout the country. Here we have precise and open declarations; names are given; the text of declarations and resolutions is reproduced. . . ." It was, however, observed in the Chinese statement that it was an open secret in Manchuria that demonstrations were organised by the Japanese guiding officers; and that resolutions and declarations were prepared by them in advance under general instructions issued by the Self-Government Guiding Board in Mukden. Few of the people who attended knew what the meeting was about. Attendance was made compulsory under threat of severe punishment.

Finally, the conditions in Manchuria to-day were described as appalling. There was no peace or tranquillity but misery and distress.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

It was observed in the Chinese document that from the foregoing comments it appeared clear that nothing in the Japanese Observations justified a modification either of the most important facts of the Manchurian situation as ascertained by the Commission of Inquiry or of the conclusions which it had drawn from its findings. The incident of September 18th, it was pointed out, had been precipitated by the Japanese military authorities in pursuance of a traditional policy of aggression and expansion on the Asiatic mainland. The continued extension of military operations into the most remote parts of Manchuria, notwithstanding the repeated pledges given to the League and other Powers not to aggravate the situation, had been carried on in execution of a preconceived and long-prepared plan of attack and occupation of the whole of Manchuria. The persistent destruction of Chinese administrative authority, the organisation of an independence movement, the creation of the "Manchukuo," and the recent act according to recognition were different stages in a fixed programme. The holding of mass meetings, the adoption of resolutions and declarations, the presentation of petitions by deputations and the organisation of demonstrations—all these were manipulated and engineered by the Japanese for the purpose of impressing other nations with a semblance of spontaneity. The underlying idea, however, had been to confront the world with a *fait accompli* and thus to signify the completion of another phase in Japan's policy of domination and conquest in the Far East.

But the interests of Japan, the Chinese document continued to explain, were not the only interests to be considered. The interests of China as the territorial sovereign in her Three Eastern Provinces and as the victim of Japanese aggression could not be disregarded. The withdrawal of the Japanese troops which Japan had on more than one occasion promised to carry out should be effected as soon as possible. The maintenance and recognition of the present régime in Manchuria as claimed by Japan would be entirely unacceptable to China. The dissolution of "Manchukuo" was said to be an indispensable condition to any satisfactory solution; it would be in the interest of peace founded upon justice that no premium should be placed upon aggression but full reparation accorded its victim.

Finally, it was observed that the Chinese Government was gratified to find itself in full accord with the Commission of Inquiry and remained equally convinced that any solution of the Sino-Japanese question "should conform to the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Pact of Paris, and the Nine Power Treaty of Washington."

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW (Monthly):

Contains articles on problems of industry and employment, based on special knowledge and research and up-to-date international statistics of unemployment, wages, cost of living, etc.

Price: per number, 2s. 6d., 60 cents; per year, 24s., \$6.00

2. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOUR INFORMATION (Weekly):

Contains, in addition to extracts from official and unofficial publications all over the world relating to current events affecting industry and labour, original information derived from the correspondence of the International Labour Office itself, and communications received directly from outside collaborators and from Governments.

Price: per number, 8d., 15 cents; per year, 30s., \$7.50

3. OFFICIAL BULLETIN (At irregular intervals):

The channel through which the International Labour Office supplies official information on matters connected with the life and work of the International Labour Organisation.

Annual Subscription: 3s. 6d. \$1.00

4. DOCUMENTS OF THE GOVERNING BODY (At irregular intervals):

Includes the full records of discussions and decisions.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

5. LEGISLATIVE SERIES (Annual):

Consists of reprints and translations of the texts of the most important laws and regulations affecting labour adopted in the different countries.

Annual Subscription (either bound volume or advance prints): 35s. \$8.75

Annual Subscription (both bound volume and advance prints): 60s. \$15.00

6. INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF LEGAL DECISIONS ON LABOUR LAW (Annual):

Price: 8s. \$2.00

7. INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY (Two-monthly):

Published every two months; intended to act as a link between those in all countries who are interested in problems of accident prevention.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 6s., \$1.50

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE (Trilingual) (Quarterly):

A bibliography of industrial hygiene and pathology.

Price: per number, 1s. 3d., 30 cents; per year, 4s., \$1.00

9. DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (Annual):

The Questionnaires* and Reports* issued by the Office in preparation for the Sessions of the Conference, the Report of the Director of the I.L.O., the Final Record of each Session, and the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted at each Session.

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

10. I.L.O. YEAR BOOK (Annual):

Annual survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation

{ Paper bound	10s. 6d.	\$3.00
{ Cloth bound	15s. 0d.	\$4.00

11. STUDIES AND REPORTS:

Consists of monographs dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Unemployment, Wages and Hours, Industrial Hygiene, Industrial Organisation, etc.*

Annual Subscription: 40s. \$10.00

In this series the following among others have been published:—

*Studies on Industrial Relations. I. xii + 263 pp.	{ Paper bound	5s. 0d.	\$1.25
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
*Studies on Industrial Relations. II. v + 162 pp.	{ Paper bound	3s. 6d.	\$1.00
	{ Cloth bound	5s. 0d.	\$2.00
Silicosis: Records of the International Conference held at Johannesburg, August, 1930. iv + 692 pp.		16s. 0d.	\$4.00
*Unemployment Problems in 1931. iv + 280 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.50
*Unemployment Problems in the United States, by H. B. Butler. v + 112 pp.	{ Paper bound	2s. 6d.	\$0.60
	{ Cloth bound	4s. 0d.	\$1.50
*Women's Work under Labour Law. iv + 264 pp.	{ Paper bound	6s. 0d.	\$1.50
	{ Cloth bound	7s. 6d.	\$2.00
A Contribution to the Study of International Comparisons of Costs of Living. xii. + 247 pp.		7s. 6d.	\$2.00
Industrial Relations in Great Britain, by J. H. Richardson. xi + 272 pp.	{ Paper Bound	3s. 6d.	\$1.00
	{ Cloth Bound	5s. 0d.	\$2.00
*Pneumoconiosis. A List of References. iv + 76 pp.		2s. 0d.	\$0.50
*Non-Contributory Pensions. viii + 140 pp.		3s. 0d.	\$0.75

ALL PRICES QUOTED ARE POST FREE.

The inclusive Subscription to the publications of the International Labour Office (other than Governing Body Documents) is £8. \$40.00

Combined Subscription to Governing Body Documents and all other publications, £9 5s. \$46.00

Note.—All the above publications are published in English and French. In addition those marked* are published in German. *Studies and Reports* (see under 11) are published in English and French and occasionally in German.

All prices quoted are post free. A full catalogue of the publications of the Office with a specimen copy of any periodical publication will be sent free on demand. Address: INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, GENEVA, Switzerland, or the following:

GREAT BRITAIN Mr. M. R. K. BURGE, 12, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1. (Telegrams: Interlab, Sowest, London.) Telephone: Victoria, 2859.)	U.S.A. American Sales Agents: WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION, 40, Mount Vernon Street, Boston 9, Mass.	JAPAN Mr. J. ASARI, Shisei Kaikan Bldg., Hibiya Park, Kojimachiku, Tokio. (Telegrams: Kokusairodo, Tokio.) Telephone: Ginza 1580.)	INDIA Mr. P. P. PILLAI, International Labour Office (Indian Branch), New Delhi. (Telegrams: Interlab, New Delhi.) Telephone: 3191.)
---	---	---	--

PERIODICALS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL

The *Official Journal*, which is published monthly (since January, 1922) in separate editions in English and French, contains the complete Minutes of the Sessions of the Council of the League of Nations, the text of the Reports and Resolutions adopted by the Council, as well as the principal official documents received or despatched by the Secretariat of the League.

Yearly subscription (12 numbers and index) £3. \$15.00

TREATY SERIES :

PUBLICATIONS OF TREATIES AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS REGISTERED BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Under the terms of Article 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations : " Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagements shall be binding until so registered." The publication of the *Treaty Series* fulfils this condition of the Covenant.

Subscription rate for 12 volumes from 400 to 500 pages each £6. \$30.00

MONTHLY BULLETIN OF STATISTICS

A synopsis of the economic position of all important countries in the world in a convenient and concise form ; indispensable to all bankers, business-men and politicians who wish to keep abreast of world movements ; showing coal, pig-iron and steel production ; foreign trade ; price movements, cost of living ; unemployment ; gold reserves and note circulation, exchange and discount rates, etc., according to official information specially supplied each month. Data apply to over 50 countries. Published on the third Thursday of each month.

Yearly subscription (12 numbers) 18s. \$4.50

QUARTERLY BULLETIN OF THE HEALTH ORGANISATION

Publication containing an editorial, original articles connected with the work of the Health Organisation, official reports submitted to the Health Committee, reviews on subjects of international interest and a survey of the work actually being done.

Yearly subscription (4 numbers) 7s. 6d. \$2.00

EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

This review contains all the documents and reports relating to the work of the League and of the Governments of the States Members in the field of instruction in international co-operation. It follows with close attention the efforts of various groups to develop methods of active international collaboration between pupils, students and teachers of different countries. Moreover, the *Educational Review* serves as an *open forum* from which professors and educationists are encouraged to express their ideas on the principles, methods and organisation of such instruction in international questions as would be likely to spread knowledge of the work of the League.

Yearly subscription (2 numbers) 4s. \$1.00

A complete Catalogue of League of Nations publications sent free on application to—

PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT OF THE LEAGUE OF
NATIONS, GENEVA.

